VOLUME VI NUMBER 3

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

JULY 1932

EDITORIAL

A GREAT BATTLE IS BEING WAGED TO-DAY ABOUT THE ESSENCE OF CHRISTIANITY. The battle has been waged before, but in our day it is being waged intensely again. It seems almost as though in some quarters the fight is over, and that the victory has been won for an interpretation of Christianity which is nothing less than an emasculation, and abandonment, of what has been historically considered as true Christianity. But the battle is not over in reality. And there are some among us who are not willing to surrender the field as though all had been lost and nothing were left to do but to retire to seclusion in pessimistic contemplation of world apostasy. Professor Enss is one of these. Passionately devoted to the historic evangelical faith of Christianity, he gives a witness to this faith which challenges the thinking of all who are concerned to understand the Christian faith in its purity and fullness. His challenge will be presented in a series of four articles, the first three of which set forth true Christianity in contrast to three types of erroneous conception of the Christian faith, while the fourth expounds the foundation and essential nature of evangelical Christianity. The four articles, which will appear in successive issues of the REVIEW are entitled: Christianity and Religion, Christianity and Mysticism, Christianity and Philosophy, Christianity and Revelation. The first one of the series appears in this number.

THE PRESENT GENERATION IS PERHAPS TOO NEAR TO THE LIFE AND ACTIVITY of the leaders who contributed to the regeneration of the Mennonite Church in the second half of the last century to appreciate the real worth of their contributions. Yet something of the greatness of the work of such men as J. M. Brenneman, J. F. Funk, and J. S. Coffman, has long been realized. Already thirty years ago, M. S. Steiner published an interpretation and appreciation of J. S. Coffman's life and labors. It is to be hoped that we may soon have a worthy biography of John Fretz Funk, whose contribution was perhaps just as great or greater than Coffman's, though in a different way. The REVIEW is glad to be able to present in

this issue, a brief appreciation of the life and labors of John Fretz Funk by one who was a close friend of his for over forty years, and who was for many years a close co-worker with Funk in the work of the Mennonite Publishing Company. A. C. Kolb's paper is not intended to be a complete biography, nor a full assessment of Funk's contribution to the Mennonite Church. Nor was it originally intended for publication. What the REVIEW presents is merely a condensation of an address delivered at a Memorial Service held at Goshen College in April, 1932, with the hope that it need not be long before a full-length biography of Funk is written with a full appraisal of the splendid contribution which he rendered to the Church of his choice which he served so devotedly and so well.

IN SELECTING LANCASTER COUNTY MENNONITISM AS THE TERRITORY FOR a short excursion into Mennonite literary history, Professor Bender has chosen one of the largest, most self-contained, most conservative, and most interesting groups of Mennonites in America for study. That the results are rather meagre is due to the meagreness of the material. Nevertheless the discussion should prove interesting and worthwhile to those who wish to become more intimately acquainted with American Mennonite life and history in its characteristic expressions.

THE REVIEW IS GLAD TO PRESENT A NEW AND VALUABLE SERIES OF ARticles on early Swiss Mennonite History by the one who is perhaps in our day most thoroughly acquainted with the history of the Swiss Brethren. John Horsch has been a frequent contributor to the REVIEW from the very beginning, and his new series of articles will be characterized by the same thoroughness and exhaustiveness which has marked his previous writing. The first article in the series, which appears in this number, deals with the development of State Church Protestantism in the early Reformation period as a background for the story of the rise of the Swiss Brethren. This preliminary discussion is necessary since the Swiss Brethren movement arose as a protest against the unbiblical and unevangelical character of the developments in State Church Protestantism. Later articles will trace the origin and early history of the movement in Zurich and St. Gall.

OF THE CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE, JOHN HORSCH, HISTORIAN AND author of Scottdale, Pa., and Harold S. Bender, Professor of Church History and Bible at Goshen College, are well-known to readers of the REVIEW. Gustav H. Enss, now Professor of Philosophy and Theology at Goshen College, was born and reared in the Alt-Samara Mennonite Colony in Russia, but has served as a pastor of Mennonite Churches, and an instructor in Mennonite Colleges in the United States for the past eighteen years. A. C. Kolb, originally a Canadian from the old Waterloo County, Ontario, Mennonite settlement, served sixteen years on the staff of the Mennonite Publishing Company at Elkhart, Indiana, and is now living again in his old home at Kitchener, Ontario.

CHRISTIANITY AND RELIGION

GUSTAV H. ENSS

The term "religion" has assumed a definite meaning in the modern mind. According to the definitions of practically all the students of the history and pyschology of religion, it has come to mean an expression of man's own emotions, the result of man's own thinking, and the fruit of man's own labors. In other words, at its best, religion is understood to be the most complete self-expression of man; or, as Pratt says, "religion is essentially a human thing."[1] A brief study of some representative definitions of religion will help us to realize this fact more clearly.

In his excellent little book on *The World's Living Religions* Dr. Hume, Professor of the History of Religions in Union Theological Seminary, New York, has published a list of carefully selected definitions, which because of their wide range of emphasis, furnish a good basis for such a brief preliminary study. We shall take them in the order in which they are given, and in connection with each mention the characteristic emphasis which Dr. Hume has found in them.

The first, with an intellectual emphasis, is by Max Müller, the great philologist and student of oriental religions: "Religion," he says, "is a mental faculty or disposition, which independent of, nay in spite of, sense and reason enables man to apprehend the Infinite under different names and under varying guises."[2] Evidently, what we have before us is a psychological interpretation. Religion is found to be a faculty of the human mind, a part of man's nature, which seeks and finds its expression in religion. As John Baillie also insists, "The roots of religion (are) in the human soul,"[3] or in other words—man is incurably religious. If this is true, if religion is a part of man's own nature, a faculty of his mind, then he could never become completely irreligious. There could only be a difference in degree, or perhaps in the form of expression of religion. In an extreme case man might fail to use all of his faculties but that would mean abnormality, or stating it more mildly, a failure in complete self-expression. But normally, we would have to say: to

1 J. B. Pratt, *The Religious Consciousness,* p. 6 (MacMillan).

2 Introduction to the *Science of Religion,* 1882 13.

3 *The Roots of Religion in the Human Soul.* (Doran).

be his whole normal self man must be religious. This may be true with regard to religion but is it also true with regard to Christianity? Are men naturally Christian?

The second definition, which has a moral emphasis, is taken from Immanuel Kant's "Critique of Practical Reason":[4] "Religion is the recognition of all duties as divine commands." While Max Müller speaks of a faculty or disposition, Kant speaks of religion as an activity. It is an act of recognition, a discovery that man makes for himself. This ability to recognize is of course based upon man's mental powers, and in so far Kant's definition reveals perhaps as much intellectual emphasis as does Max Müller's. The difference lies in the fact that Max Müller finds the apprehension of the Infinite of primary importance and seems to think that what may be called God-consciousness constitutes religion, while in Kant's definition the existence of God is a fundamental assumption and the emphasis is on human attitudes towards duties in the light of this God-consciousness. Man by experience discovers the moral law. Because of his own evil inclinations he realizes that this law is an objective reality to which he must conform. An objective reality must have its origin in divine authority. Therefore in the moral law, which places duties upon man, the commands of God must be recognized. Thus Kant arrives at his definition of religion, which places upon man the moral obligation to live a life of justice and righteousness in spite of evil inclinations. John Baillie in his book, "The Roots of Religion in the Human Soul", quotes the following passage from the closing paragraph of Kant's "Träume eines Geistersehers" (Dreams of a Spiritseer), "It seems more in accordance with human nature and with the purity of morals to base the expectation of a future world on the sentiments of a well-behaved soul, than contrariwise to base its good behavior on the hope of another world" . . . . And Baillie remarks to this: "How good it is to see the truth of religion grounded at last neither upon cosmological, teleological and ontological demonstrations on the one hand, nor upon esoteric mystic visions on the other, but upon 'the sentiments of a well-behaved soul!' "[5] The question however arises: What difference does it make whether religion be based upon sentiments or upon rational arguments? Are sentiments more dependable than reason? Are not both simply aspects of human personality? We may divide hu-

---

[4] Translated by Abbott, p. 226.

[5] John Baillie, *The Roots of Religion in the Human Soul,* p. 124.

man personality for the purpose of analytical study, but such divisions, we know, are only imaginary. Personality is a unit, it cannot be divided. The question of greater importance for us to-day is, whether religion is grounded exclusively in human personality or whether it is also somehow grounded in God. If the latter is the case, then religion is objectively justified but if it is not, then the whole matter of religion must appear as a very questionable endeavor. Kant's definition, indeed, makes religion a matter of human behavior regulated by the recognition of all duties as divine commands, which recognition, of course, is the result of philosophical reasoning. Is this also Christianity?

The third definition with the same moral emphasis is by Matthew Arnold; he says: "Religion is morality touched by emotion".[6] It was necessary to list both Arnold's and Kant's definitions. Though both have the moral emphasis, there is a marked difference between them. Nothing of the intellectual emphasis is left in Arnold's definition. Religion is simply morality. As he says in another place, "The object of religion is conduct". The divine commands are erased from the picture. The mental struggle of Kant has lost its significance, but the emotional interest is rightfully finding its way into the business of moral living. While Kant's definition is strictly philosophical, we have here a return to a psychological interpretation. Religion, accordingly, is conduct governed by will and emotion. It is a strictly human affair, not even demanding the whole of human personality. Of the three major aspects of personality: intelligence, volition and emotion, will has received the preëminence with just a touch of emotion. The tendency to localize religion within human nature is evident again, which may be perfectly justified, but Christianity cannot be so localized. Does Arnold's definition in any way touch the essential character of the Christian faith? Not in the least.

The fourth definition, by Schleiermacher, is widely known as the interpretation of religion in terms of feeling: "The essence of religion, he claims, is the feeling of absolute dependence."[7] Why Schleiermacher's definition should have received so much attention can be understood only from the general reaction against the rationalism of his time. In itself it conveys a feeling of despair in regard to the subject of religion. It places religion, if we use Dr. William McDougal's analysis of human emotions in his "Outline of Psychology", into the class of primary emotions, and must be

---

6 *Literature and Dogma,* p. 46.

7 *Discourses on Religion,* chapter 2.

considered as the outgrowth of the "instinct of submission". As a feeling of "absolute dependence" religion is not only localized within the sphere of emotions, but here in this one aspect of human personality, it occupies only a very small section—that of the "negative self-feeling". It is hidden away in one little corner for safe-keeping, as it were. To-day we would call such religion an inferiority complex. The poverty of the definition is evident, yet there is something of significance in it. It points to something in religion which will always play an important part in it, the awareness or the sense of need. That "the feeling of absolute dependence" is a general human creature-feeling will be readily conceded, also, that in religion as well as in Christianity this feeling is openly affirmed, but what is the next step in religion? And what is the next step in Christianity? The affirmation of some aspect in human nature does not define Christian faith nor even religion.

In the fifth definition taken from Allan Menzie's "History of Religion", 13, Dr. Hume finds the emphasis on worship. It reads as follows: "Religion is the worship of higher powers from the sense of need". This is brief, pointed and inclusive. As a definition it is the best in Dr. Hume's list. It does not split up human personality. It suggests the underlying cause for religion (need of man). It indicates in a general way the method in religion (worship) and speaks of the direction in which man invariably turns for help in his need (the higher powers). Without doubt these are the essential characteristics of religion. The word "need" expresses the whole misery of man which causes him to seek relief outside of himself. Whether it be personal, social, economic, or any other kind of misery, the sum total of all miseries, in whatever form, produces in man this sense of need, which presses him into a kind of activity which is commonly called worship, taking the term in its broadest sense. The higher powers may be real or imaginary, that matters little, the fact is that man worships. Worship, in whatever form, is that cry of the human soul, which for millenniums has filled the universe with anxiety, hope, and despair. At times it has become so intense and heart-rending that, if there be any "higher powers", there should be some kind of answer to the continuous cry of mankind. But our definitions are silent about the answer; they only know of the quest. That is the sad part of religion. It leaves man alone in his misery. His self-exertions in worship may give him a temporary satisfaction, but there is no final relief; he is left to himself. Whether theism or pantheism, monotheism or polytheism, in religion as defined by the various

authors, man is the sole actor. Whether in self-abasement as in Hinduism or in self-aggrandisement as in modern western types of religion, it is all the same; man stages the whole procedure himself. Is that the case also in Christianity? We do not think so.

The sixth definition, by Albert Reville, with an emphasis on self-advantage is perhaps not meant to be a full definition. It is rather a suggestion of what might be the underlying cause for religion: "Religion, we read, rests above all, upon the need of man to realize an harmonious synthesis between his own destiny and the opposing influences he meets in the world."[8] The need of man is mentioned again but in a rather narrow sense of the word. It is a shallow interpretation of it, which places religion on the level of business competition in the battle for existence. It is "human, all too human", to use one of Nietzsche's phrases. Civilization may also, and perhaps more properly, be said to rest on this need. We turn to the next.

The seventh is by Edward Scribner Ames. It has the social emphasis; he says: "Religion is the consciousness of highest social values".[9] In its poverty as a definition it resembles that of Schleiermacher's; in its emphasis it is entirely different. It has nothing of the inferiority complex of Schleiermacher's, but it suggests no activity, it betrays no appreciation of the desperate struggles of mankind in the past and present, and points only to one aspect of human life, the social. Religion most certainly has to do also with the realization of social values, but to call the mere consciousness of such values religion marks it simply as a psychological state. The question of course arises, Is this "consciousness of highest social values" an achievement or is it an inborn capacity? Yet, whatever the answer would be, it would not bring us one step further in relation to Christianity. We may say without boasting that Christianity has produced and is still producing the highest social values, but that is a by-product, a result of Christian faith by which it may be recognized as absolutely constructive and positive. Still the producing agency is not the product, and if we wish to speak of this producing agency we shall have to speak in altogether different terms. This we expect to do in the second part of this book.

The eighth definition, by William James, reveals the individual emphasis: "Religion, therefore, as I ask you arbitrarily to take it," he says, "shall mean for us the feelings, acts and experiences of individual men in their solitude, so far as they apprehend them-

8 *Religions of Non-civilized Peoples,* p. 120.

9 *Psychology of Religious Experience,* VII.

selves to stand in relation to whatever they may consider the divine".[10] For James, religion is a private matter—"man in his solitude". In a way it seems to be an exact opposite to Ames conception, and no doubt within the range of emphasis there is a marked difference. But, as in the previous definitions, it is again man and his feelings, his acts, his experiences and his apprehension. Religion remains a monologue, the divine remains silent, and a great uncertainty broods over us. Oh, that the heavens would rend in twain and that He who is imagined behind the clouds of human uncertainty might appear in reality! Is there reality in religion? Who knows? As far as man's own activity is concerned, that may be real enough, but as to the divine, man simply "apprehends himself to stand in relation to whatever he may consider the divine". Strong convictions, if not based on objective facts, cannot change the situation. Even Dwight Bradley's full "measure of subjective reality"[11] has no healing in its wings. As long as religion remains a monologue it remains fundamentally different from Christianity.

The ninth, by Professor G. W. Stratton, takes religion as the supreme idealizing process: "Religion is the appreciation of an unseen world, usually an unseen company, and religion is also whatever seems clearly to be moving toward such an appreciation, or to be returning from it. Or perhaps it might be better described as man's whole bearing toward what seems to him the Best or Greatest."[12] The word *usually* sounds that tone of uncertainty which is always present in religion, even in its most fanatic dogmatism. The gist of this definition is found in the last phrase "man's whole bearing toward what seems to him" . . . . This whole matter of religion appears here as a mystery, a big question mark, a sphinx. Who can solve it? At least it becomes more and more problematic, the more one studies Professor Stratton's definition. Perhaps we should first ask the question, what or who is man, and let anthropology clear up the mystery. Indeed our modern science of religion constitutes only a chapter in anthropology. Perhaps that is as it should be. Let anthropology select and arrange the facts, and then let philosophy work them into systems. The result will be something like John Baillie's "Interpretation of Religions," with strong leanings toward Christianity, or something entirely different. As long as we concern ourselves with "man's

---

[10] *Varieties of Religious Experience,* 31.

[11] Dwight Bradley, *The Recovery of Religion.*

[12] *Psychology of the Religious Life,* 343.

bearing" alone we have not yet found the rock bottom of Christian faith.

The last definition in Dr. Hume's list is an attempt to identify religion with Christianity, or reduce Christianity to the level of religion. It is Professor William Adams Brown's definition of religion, which in Dr. Hume's opinion seeks to include all the emphases found in the other definitions. He says: "By religion is meant the life of man in his superhuman relations; that is, his relation to the power on which he feels himself dependent, the authority to which he deems himself responsible, and the unseen being with whom he is capable of communing. In the ideal of religion, dependence, responsibility and communion belong together".[13] The definition is well put together. But are these "superhuman relations", spoken of in Brown's definition, a matter of real experience, or are they only self-deceptions? Man "feels himself dependent", he "deems himself responsible" . . . . How does he know that he is not mistaken about it? And what about this "unseen being", with whom he is capable of communing? Is there any such unseen being? Has He at any time revealed Himself? Religion usually assumes such an existence, but who is this existence if not man's own inference or imagination? Does Professor Brown's definition carry us beyond ourselves? Not a single step. He speaks in the name of man and from the human standpoint. He remains, therefore, within the limits of religion. That means, he does not speak of Christianity, for in Christianity the human standpoint must be left once and for all, to place one's feet upon the Rock of Ages which is not moved by the storms of time.

We would not like to leave the impression, however, that we are not conscious of the fact that definitions, snatched from the writings of various authors, are after all very inadequate expressions of their fully rounded out conceptions of religion. Still, the main point made in this analysis will hardly be contested by liberals, and should not be objected to by conservatives, namely that "religion is an essentially human thing." It has been the common mistake of conservatives to object to the concept of religion as presented by practically all modern students of religion. They demand a concept which would be applicable also to real Christianity. We insist that such objections are out of place and that the method of proving Christianity to be a higher type of religion is wrong from start to finish. It signifies a misconception of Christianity as well as of religion. Let religion be what it really is,—

---

13 William Adams Brown, *Christian Theology in Outline,* 20.

the S. O. S. call of the human soul expressed in words and deeds, in creeds and cults, in religious systems and institutions. The distinguishing marks between Christianity and the religions of the world are not a matter of degree but of essence. To make it rather emphatic and yet speaking our true conviction we would make this tentative statement: *Whatever religion is, Christianity is not, and whatever constitutes Christianity, does not enter into religion.*

The classifications of religions, which invariably include Christianity, even though Christianity be given the highest place in the arrangement, are woefully misleading. As far as the arrangement is concerned, it makes no difference whatever, whether we classify Christianity with the higher, or with the lower types of religion; the error is not in the arrangement of the classification, but in the fundamental assumption that Christianity is one among many religions, or *the* religion. Professor John Baillie is mistaken when he says, "Christianity, I am glad to think, is not a special brand of religion, as it were; it is just religion itself, religion at its best and at its widest,"[14] repeating in these words what Dean Inge, whom he quotes approvingly, had said before him, "The gospel of Christ is not a religion, but religion itself, in its universal and deepest significance".[15] It would be fatal if it were true. The great scholar of Berlin, Dr. Adolf Harnack, also participated in this vicious error. Max Müller said once: "Wer eine Religion kennt, kennt keine"—"He who knows but one religion, knows none at all", pointing to the advantage of comparative study of religions, to which Harnack replied: "Wer diese Religion kennt, kennt alle"—"He who knows this religion (meaning christianity) knows them all". Harnack meant to serve the cause of christianity but instead he gave expression to the most erroneous idea, which has worked such havoc in modern theology.

Whether we pursue the historical study of the religions of the world, or whether we follow the analysis of the psychology of religion, the results are practically the same: religion is seen to be a creation of man's own mind. As Professor Pratt says it very clearly: "This subjective nature of religion seems to be almost a discovery of our own times. The Eighteenth Century practically identified religion with theology, and it was not till after the psychology of Schleiermacher, on the one hand, and the evolutionary point of view on the other, got well ingrained in the minds of writers on re-

---

[14] John Baillie, *Roots of Religion in the Human Soul.*

[15] *Outspoken Essays,* First Series, p. 229, quoted by Baillie.

ligion that the relatively subordinate position of any particular belief within the life of religion was appreciated. The origin of religion is now sought for not in any external revelation but within the subjective needs of human nature, and its development is to be reached through purely human influences, as is the case with language, morality, and art. Thus we have come to see that religion is essentially a human thing, a biological product and instrument".[16] We accept the verdict as far as religion is concerned. In fact we are in perfect agreement with this conclusion. It was true of the Greek and Roman religions as it is true to-day of Hinduism, Buddhism and of all other religious cults. We venture to think that it is true also of modern religious liberalism and perhaps even of some forms of so-called orthodoxy. We might just as well face the facts and repent.

Is it anything else but man-made religion that modern liberalism is advocating to-day? Is its "theology" anything but religious philosophy of one type or another? The whole pride of modernism is based upon its so-called intellectual emancipation, which in its last analysis means nothing less than that religion is still in the making, and that the creative mind of modern man is hard at work achieving a new and better religion. The religious pragmatists are working in that direction; Dr. Wieman of Chicago is certainly in earnest about it. Most of the modernists, however, are still busily engaged in tearing down "outworn traditions", an activity which seems to afford them a great deal of satisfaction. But there is nothing positive in that. It is purely negative.

On the other hand, it is obviously possible to set up an orthodox system, outwardly conforming to the letter and inwardly denying the power of the Spirit. The denunciations which came from the lips of Christ of such hypocritical schemes need only be mentioned to fill us with fear and trembling. There is such a thing as making a stupid religious cult out of what was intended to be true Christian faith. The Roman Catholic Church has never been entirely free from this tendency, and the Greek Orthodox Church in Russia had gone about as far as can be imagined in the process of turning Christianity into a man-made religious cult. There have been distressing periods also in the Protestant Church when "right doctrine" or "orthodoxy" received more adoration and worship than the Savior Himself. There is further such a thing as bibliolatry, which becomes a religious cult of exactly the same nature as any stupid idol-worship. For such behavior the term religion is very

[16] J. B. Pratt, *The Religious Consciousness*, p. 6.

fitting, whereas the term Christian faith would be a misapplication. It may be difficult to decide in every case where Christian faith ends and where religion begins, but in concept the distinction ought to be clear. Religion is essentially phenomenalistic, it glories in outward appearance, clings to things and forms and rituals; while true Christian faith reckons with ultimate spiritual realities. Christian faith, expressed in life, must necessarily express itself in some kind of a form, but the form itself is not so essential to real Christianity, it is rather incidental, concurrent or attendant. In Christianity spiritual reality is the decisive factor. Orthodoxy, therefore, which remains pure form shares the nature of religion, though it may well be classed as a higher type of religion. Once and for all we must realize, that there are no substitutes for the living and life-giving Christian faith. All imitations, however cleverly devised, lack the creative power of the Holy Spirit, and therefore automatically fall back into the category of religion, which has always been an open receptacle for all kinds of humanly devised cults of worship and objectively unfounded beliefs in imaginary deities. To put Christianity into this same category would suggest that it possesses fundamental characteristics in common with these cults and beliefs; this is not the case. For Christianity, as we shall endeavor to show in the succeeding chapters, has its origin not in man but in God; its rock-foundation is not the "subjective needs of human nature" but the revelation of God in Christ, and its proof is given in the Christian experience of regeneration.

Therefore, judging from the concept of religion, now firmly established in the modern mind, in spite of the numerous implications which may result from such a demand, we must insist that Christianity be not called the latest, nor the noblest, nor the highest type of religion, seeing it is no religion at all.[17] Some twelve years ago the author made this same demand in a lecture. Recently Karl Barth in Germany, particularly in his "Dogmatik", has insisted on exactly the same discrimination. In 1927 Dr. A. C. Gaebelein of New York published a book under the title "Christianity or Religion" which follows in the same direction. It is evident that religion, as we know it from all the different sources, is simply a quest for God, an expression of the deepest longings of the human heart. The gospel of Christ, however, is not a quest, it

---

[17] The author is well aware of the difficulties involved in such a readjustment of our phraseology, but in the interest of truth and clarity it should be done anyhow. In fact we are doing it already in substituting the term "Christian education" for "religious education," where such a discrimination was felt very desirable.

is an answer; and not an answer of man but an answer of God by way of revelation. It may be said that in a way religion and Christianity supplement each other as human need and divine grace, notwithstanding the fact that practically all the religions offer some kind of a balm for the ills of humanity. Religious cults simply dramatize the misery of man; the revelation of God in Christ, on the other hand, demonstrates the justice and love and the saving power of God. We need not condemn religion as such, though we must condemn some of its practices, but as soon as the gospel of Christ takes effect in the heart of man the shadows of religion must vanish forever for the gospel of Christ is the end of all religion. The student of Christian theology, therefore, must be led to understand very clearly, that his particular task is not the study and interpretation of the religions of the world, to "know what religion really is". That is the task of the philosophy of religion. His primary task is the study of the word of God as given in the self-revelation of God in Christ Jesus the Lord and giver of life, in order that he may know in turn what to give to dying humanity.

JOHN FRETZ FUNK, 1835-1930: AN APPRECIATION*

AARON C. KOLB

Born April 6, 1835, in Hilltown Township, Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

Taught first school in his native county, in 1854, at the age of 19.

Engaged in the lumber business in Chicago, in April, 1857.

Was converted during the winter of 1857-58 at protracted meetings held in a Presbyterian Church in Chicago, but subsequently united with the Line Lexington Mennonite Church in his home community, in the winter of 1859-1860.

Was elected Superintendent of the Milwaukee Depot Mission Sunday School, Chicago, in 1861.

Published his first booklet, "War,—Its Evils,—Our Duty," in 1863.

Published the first issue of Herald of Truth, in January, 1864.

Married Salome Kratz, of Bucks County, Penna., January 19, 1864.

Was ordained to the ministry in the Mennonite Church near Gardner, Grundy County, Illinois, in May, 1865, by Bishop John M. Brenneman.

Moved his printing plant to Elkhart, Indiana, April 6, 1867.

Organized the Elkhart congregation and promoted the building of the meeting house in the (then) outskirts of Elkhart, in 1871.

Conducted conjointly with Daniel Brenneman the first series of meetings held anywhere in the Mennonite Church, at Masontown, Pennsylvania, in 1872.

Established the Mennonite Publishing Company in Elkhart, Indiana, in 1875.

Organized the Mennonite Aid Plan in 1882.

Organized the Evangelizing Fund, which developed into the present Mennonite Mission Board, in 1882.

Was ordained to the office of bishop, June 6, 1892.

Sponsored the opening of the Mennonite Home Mission, in Chicago, in 1893.

Presided at the ordination of the first missionaries sent by the Mennonite Church to the foreign field (India), in 1898.

Became inactive as bishop January 31, 1902.

Died peacefully while asleep, in Elkhart, Indiana, January 8, 1930.

Reached the ripe age of 94 years, 9 months, and 2 days, having been used of God in the ministry for nearly 65 years, and having exceeded the ordinary allotted span of life by nearly a score of years. "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord . . . they rest from their labors, and their works do follow them." Rev. 14:13.

---

* A condensation of a biographical address delivered at the Memorial Service for John Fretz Funk, 1835-1930, held in Assembly Hall at Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana, April 10th, 1932.

Thus reads a brief summary of the sojourn in this world of one of God's heroes, whose unwavering faith was demonstrated by tireless, self-sacrificing devotion to God through service to his fellowmen, in a measure and to a degree very much beyond the ordinary. It is in memory of this man of God, and what his life and work have meant to the Mennonite Church, that we have met here to-day.

History shows that pre-natal influences, circumstances and environment, coupled with an active working faith in God, contribute mightily to the developing of men of extraordinary stamina, faith, courage, and leadership. Men of distinction, whose names are engraved upon the granite of memory—men who gave not merely of their superfluity, but who "first gave themselves unto the Lord" (II Cor. 8:5), and then voluntarily made generous sacrifices of time, talent and means,—such are the men whose achievements have honored God and helped humanity. Among the outstanding, devoted servants of the faith of our fathers, may well be numbered the subject of our to-day's memorial service, one of the outstanding leaders of the church in its two and a half centuries of history in America. I do not contemplate indulging in anything even remotely akin to hero worship—a tendency which seems to have become somewhat commonplace, but for our inspiration I deem it profitable that we take a little time to reflect upon the way God may use individuals who are willing to be used of Him, even in these latter days. It is for our profit and inspiration that God has so wonderfully preserved the records of His servants as revealed in the Scriptures. He is still using consecrated individuals to carry on His work and extend His Kingdom.

In view of the important contributions which John F. Funk has made to the Mennonite Church, it is fitting that we should review briefly the background of his remarkable career, and trace his activities which extended through such a long period of years. Generations before his birth, we can find factors which contributed to the making of his character. His great-great-grandfather, Bishop Heinrich Funk, braved the perils of the deep in 1717 to find in America freedom to worship God according to the faith believed by Mennonites to be soundly scriptural. He was a deep, clear thinker, and an able writer, as is shown by his book, *Restitution,* which is still recognized as an important book in our Mennonite literature. In 1748 when the Mennonites of Pennsylvania had made arrangements to translate from the Dutch into the German language, and publish the book, *Der Blutige Schauplatz oder Maertyrer Spiegel*

(*The Bloody Theatre or Martyrs' Mirror*), Heinrich Funk and Dielman Kolb were chosen a committee to oversee and compare translations.*

Jacob Funk, the father of the subject of this address, was a somewhat stern man, but very intelligent, and unusually broad-minded and progressive. His mother, Susanna Fretz Funk, was a woman of great sweetness of character. Old friends of the family have said that in their son John could be plainly recognized the combined characteristics of both parents.

The Funk homestead in Hilltown Township, Bucks County, Pennsylvania, was a pleasant one, and throughout all his life the boy who was born there, April 6, 1835, remembered it with most affectionate regard. Among his earliest recollections was that of attending worship with his parents at the age of three. From his childhood years he cultivated reverence toward God and respect for worship. These traits were strongly emphasized as years went by. An indication of the trend of his mind may be found in that at the age of nine he had memorized over 1,600 verses of Scripture. These formed a marvelous background for his ability to quote Scripture in his sermons, which was almost phenomenal.

Largely due to his own determination, he succeeded in obtaining a good education, including two terms at Freeland Seminary (now Ursinus College), and at the age of nineteen, secured a position as a school teacher. Imbued with originality and progressiveness, he introduced a number of new features in his method of teaching which made very favorable impressions upon the public.

An appreciation of his keen interest in religious trends, stated in eloquent literary style and taste which he developed commendably at an early age, and which characterized his writings as well as his sermons in later years, is afforded by reading his "Journal" (as he called it) which he wrote while teaching his second year of school. In this journal he recites many impressions, recording them in minutest detail, making the portrayal of his surroundings to convey a reality to the mind of the reader almost as though pho-

* It is a remarkable coincidence that one hundred and forty years later, a great-great-grandson of Heinrich Funk, John F. Funk, should engage in the same kind of work in the translation of the same book from the Dutch (Holland) into the English language. There were ten thousand pages of manuscript, all of which Funk read over with the greatest care, although the main work of translating was done by Joseph Sohm, and required three years' time. The second English edition of the *Martyrs' Mirror* was published by the Mennonite Publishing Company, in Elkhart, Indiana, in 1886, at an expense of upwards of six thousand dollars.

tographed. He relates incidents pertaining to school life, the neighbors, the scenic grandeur of the community, the religious services, together with personal comment or reflections, indicating depth of thought and broadness of understanding, couched in language which fairly breathes reverence, while his choice of words, the scope of his vocabulary, embellished with the skill of an artist, makes the reading fascinating. Out of his experiences he drew personal lessons or philosophies which he sought to apply to his own life.

At the age of twenty-two he accepted an offer of employment from his brother-in-law, Jacob Beidler, who was engaged in the lumber business in Chicago. His account of leaving home is very touching, but he felt very conscious that his mother's prayers would follow him wherever he went. When he left home, his possessions consisted of two suits of clothes and $60.00 in cash. With this meagre supply of worldly possessions he arrived in Chicago on Saturday morning, April 11, 1857. His first impressions of the "muddy city" were not very favorable. However, the next day, his first Sunday in Chicago, he accompanied his brother-in-law to church, and immediately enrolled in a Sunday School class.

At the time when he decided to go West, his mind was absorbed with business prospects rather than special religious work, but when he entered upon his business duties, he writes he was led by both his own inclinations and surrounding circumstances into Church and Sunday School work, and it seemed to him as though a kind heavenly Father was leading in ways he had not known before, so that in a comparatively short time, in addition to being a pupil in one Sunday School, he was teacher in a second, and superintendent in a third.

Of his activities on Sundays he writes that in addition to attending three Sunday Schools he also attended two church services. These connections made Sunday in Chicago a very busy day, but this seems quite characteristic of his life, for, nearly sixty years later, on Sunday, July 24, 1921, when he was 86 years old, he attended four public services in one day in addition to three in private homes. Throughout his life, Funk was not the kind to neglect any detail connected with Church work, no matter what the cost to him in time or convenience. Few men had greater sympathy for the sick and afflicted, and it seems I can still hear the echoes of his petitions to God in behalf of the sick and afflicted, the sorrowing and the distressed, the poor and the needy, the aged and the infirm, the widow and the orphan.

It was through his connection with Sunday School work in 1861 that he made the acquaintance of Dwight L. Moody, the world-renowned evangelist, as they were both teachers in the same Sunday School. Several years after Moody had died, when a memorial service was held in Chicago, by special arrangement Funk was present and given a place on the platform. He regarded very highly his association with Moody, for it afforded him much inspiration. He told me once that Moody's life was so full of religious enthusiasm that one could not help being moved, pushed or drawn into a blessed religious experience. It was while he and Moody were out distributing tracts that they walked together to a Methodist Church where he attended for the first time, a Young People's Meeting, although this was by no means the last.

His Conversion

It was during the winter of 1857-8, when he graduated with honors from the Bell & Stratton Commercial College, that he attended protracted meetings held in the Third Presbyterian Church in Chicago, and was there led to consecrate himself to God in a devoted Christian life. Of this he writes: "I gave myself to God as His servant, to walk and live in His fear." But he did not unite with the Presbyterian Church because he was taught to believe and maintain the Mennonite faith and doctrines, and some parts of the Presbyterian doctrines, especially such as predestination, war, oaths, infant baptism, etc., were so different, that he could not accept them. In speaking on the subject of his association with the Presbyterian Church some time later with Rev. Frank Talmage, son of the noted T. DeWitt Talmage, this eminent clergyman said to him, "Oh, you were not predestinated to be a Presbyterian," to which Funk's comment is, "I think Frank was right." He recognized that the Lord led him to the firm decision to become and remain a Mennonite. Probably one factor in this decision was his careful study of a book written by his great-great-grandfather, Bishop Heinrich Funk. He had promised his Heavenly Father that if spared to visit the old home of his boyhood days, where he had for a long time sat under the preaching of the doctrines maintained by the Mennonite Church, he would there unite with the church of his fathers. That is exactly what he did. He was baptized at the Line Lexington Church, Bucks Co., Pa., in the winter of 1859-60. And from that day forward he became more and more devoted to religious work, both in Sunday School and church. Shortly after this, upon his return to Chicago, he made his first public address in a Sunday School to which he had been invited.

The first Mennonite Church in the vicinity of Chicago of which he learned, was at Sterling, Illinois, but it was a small congregation, and he was a stranger to all the members. It was not until 1862 that he learned of a Mennonite Church in the vicinity of Elkhart, Indiana. This was the Yellow Creek congregation. He went there in the autumn of 1862 on a visit, remaining several days. On that occasion 48 young people, mostly young men, were received into Church fellowship by water baptism on a Saturday. On Sunday following, the ordinances of communion and feet-washing were observed, at which over 600 participated. These services afforded him much pleasure and inspiration. He was a stranger there, and was quite amused to hear himself being referred to as "that young fellow from Chicago". It was at these services that he made the acquaintance of Bishop John M. Brenneman, who in later years became one of his closest co-workers.

His First Evangelistic Effort

occurred some time later when he visited the Mennonite Church near Gardner, Grundy County, Illinois. By that time he had become quite accustomed to public speaking, and after the regular sermon, when the minister gave liberty to others to speak, as was customary in some places in those days, he asked for and received permission to address the congregation. The result of that address was that at the close of the services, a young man and his wife came forward and made application to be received into fellowship.

The Urge for Mennonite Literature

A matter which rested heavily upon his heart was to see that while other Churches had their religious papers, the Mennonites did not have theirs. This caused him much concern. Thus early in life he conceived the idea that if the Mennonite Church was to prosper and grow, and maintain the doctrines she espoused, one of the primary essentials was that she must have her own literature. But this involved other problems which required several years more of patience, perseverance and prayer. We shall come to this a little later.

In 1861 or 1862 he was elected superintendent of the Milwaukee Depot Mission Sunday School. At this time the whole country was in a state of feverish anxiety due to the war which had broken out. For four years anxiety, distress and bloodshed swept over the whole country and this he described as being among the sad periods of his life. It must be remembered that at such a time the attitude the Mennonite Church took in regard to war, was not

popular. But these days were only preparing him for specific service. With anguish of soul he thrust himself upon God, desiring to know what he might do, and God, to whom he so often refers as "Kind Heavenly Father" gently led him on.

During these restless days, on May 25th, 1863, the Sunday School held an anniversary, and it was upon this occasion that he received an altogether unexpected visit from two ministers, Peter Nissley, of Lancaster County, Penna., and Bishop John M. Brenneman, of Allen County, Ohio. Unusual circumstances, due to non-Sunday train service, necessitating lying over from Saturday until Monday, thrust this visit upon Funk, who later on attributed this to a direct leading of God. This visit provided one of the most trying hours of his life up to that time. Obviously it was necessary for Funk to be present at the anniversary. Conscious of the fact that the well-established rules of the Church not only gave no permission to hold Sunday Schools, but definitely discouraged them, he feared to invite them to go with him. Of this trying situation he wrote these simple words: "But the Lord was with me. . . . When I asked the brethren to accompany me, they offered no excuse, but on the contrary showed evidence they were glad to do so. In fact they appeared quite pleased for such an opportunity, and both seemed to enjoy the Scripture recitations, singing, talks and prayers; and in fact all the exercises throughout. . . . The Lord wanted it that way. His ways are not our ways, nor His thoughts our thoughts. . . . It was a wonderful encouragement that the work should have found favor with them instead of incurring their disapproval."

After the Sunday School Nissley went to spend the night with some friends, but Brenneman accompanied Funk. It was on this occasion that he called Brenneman's attention to work he had done in preparing a little booklet of sixteen pages or more, entitled, "War,—Its Evils,—Our Duty". They discussed this together, and then it developed that Brenneman had contemplated something of a similar nature, but because political opinion of the people at that time was at a rather high tension, he feared that publication of such a work at just such a time, might cause trouble. Funk, however, was of a different turn of mind. He was not so ready to permit fear to thwart what he felt was a direct conviction from God, and to God he must be true. He felt impelled to complete his little work, and so had it printed in 1863, distributing it among the ministers and young men of the Church. This might, therefore, be considered as being his first publication. It happened that Funk preserved in his

safe two copies of this booklet one of which he presented to me, and the other subsequently found its way into the possession of the library of Goshen College, to be preserved with other literary treasures. So far as known, these are the only two copies extant. The publication and distribution of this booklet right in a time when war was in progress, seemed like a bold move, but was very characteristic of Funk. (Later in the same year an edition of this booklet was published by the Canadian brethren at Markham, Ont.) It served to encourage Brenneman to complete his booklet entitled "Christianity and War". He sent the manuscript to Funk who went over it carefully, and had it printed in 1863. Subsequent issues found wide distribution.

The Herald of Truth

Having now made a start in publishing such literature as he felt the Mennonite Church needed, Funk's thoughts again turned to the need of a Church paper. Carefully planning his way and brushing aside what others deemed to be insurmountable barriers, he continued in his determination to bring to a reality what he felt was an urgent call to a specific service. I might say that about this time, or a little earlier, according to a note in Funk's manuscript, the brotherhood in Canada had thought of a similar step, but because of the expense involved, it was considered impracticable for the time being, so was postponed. By the time December had arrived, Funk had completed the manuscripts for what was to be the first issue of a Church paper, which he thought proper should be published in both the English and German languages so that the whole Church might derive the benefits it was hoped such a venture might produce. The English paper was christened *Herald of Truth,* and the German, which was in the main a translation of the English, *Herold der Wahrheit.* These bore the date of January, 1864, and when the first day of that year came, *the first issue of our first Church paper* was off the press, ready to be mailed. The day was cold and stormy. The thermometer registered 30 degrees below zero. Business in general was suspended. Trains did not run for several days. But Funk's heart was warm. His ambitions were kindled with a deep desire to render service to God, whom he thanked fervently for having led him thus far, confident He would lead him still farther.

It may be of interest to know what were the contents of the first issue of the *Herald of Truth.* Here is a list: Morning Hymn (poem); Shall we have a Church paper? by J. F. Funk; The World

and Religion (a select item); The Herald of Truth,—Its Mission, by Daniel Brenneman; A Sabbath on the Prairie, by J. F. Funk; A select poem, "The Weeping Convert"; An Appeal to the Readers, by the editor; A Word to the Brethren, by J. F. Funk; Peace Be With You All That Are in Christ Jesus, by J. M. Brenneman; Man's Social Relation, by M. K.; Children's Column, by J. F. Funk; Select Item, "The Great Work"; Marriage Notice,—Lewis Kulp to Nancy Tinsman (this is the Lewis Kulp after whom the Women's Dormitory at Goshen College is named); also two death notices. Funk's close associates in this early venture were two brothers, John M. and Daniel Brenneman, the latter contributing considerable poetry, of which the first verse in the first issue of the *Herald of Truth,* reads as follows:

Thou Harbinger of Truth,
The aged and the youth,—
  Yea, all mankind
Thy messages should know.
Then up and quickly go,
Beside all waters sow
  Truth so refined.

Funk likewise possessed the gift of presenting thought in verse, but illustrations must be given elsewhere. The poem "A Sabbath on the Prairie", also in the first issue, referred to his spending a Sunday in Illinois, the first lines being as follows:

A Sabbath well spent
Brings a week of content,
And strength for the toils of to-morrow.

After mailing the first issue of the *Herald of Truth,* and having prepared in advance some manuscripts for the next issue to be published a month later, he started on a trip to Pennsylvania, during which visit he was married to Salome Kratz, on the 19th day of January, 1864, by Isaac Moyer, who was the officiating minister, at the Deep Run Mennonite Church. This event had been somewhat delayed because of his busy life, for it seems he could hardly find enough spare time to enable him to get married. After the ceremony, he and his bride left for the West, establishing their new home at 42 South Morgan St., Chicago. They lived in happy relations for 54 years, when God called to Himself this noble mother in Israel. To this union were born six children, four of whom died in infancy. This sorrow unquestionably had much to do with developing in Funk a spirit of deep, genuine sympathy he always felt for those who suffered affliction. Two daughters, Martha and Phoebe, were left to share the vicissitudes of home life through ensuing years. Phoebe was married to Abram B. Kolb.

She passed on to her reward on March 12, 1918. Martha remained single, and was the last survivor of the family. Her death occurred very unexpectedly after a very short illness on June 24, 1930.

After his return from Pennsylvania, Funk was very busy. Being bookkeeper for the lumber firm of McMullen, Funk & Co., he spent ten hours per day at the office. He had now undertaken the responsibility of editing two papers each month,—one English and the other German. This meant much additional hard work, especially that of editing the German paper, for he was not as proficient in that language as an editor should be. But with characteristic energy he applied himself with all diligence and overcame this handicap. Howbeit, the physical strain was too great. So tired out would he become at times, working late night after night, that he would lie down on the hard floor to snatch a few minutes' sleep, only to get up and work more. Work increased, and his faithful wife rendered much assistance by helping him to fold and mail the papers, but by fall he found the work too heavy to continue in that way, for in the meantime his correspondence had grown to considerable proportions. He began the publishing business without any outside help, without any list of subscribers, and depended only upon the income which the subscriptions he secured, would bring. He had promised the Lord that if he would have 1000 subscribers by the end of the first year, he would accept it as an indication that the Lord wanted him to continue. The subscription price of the paper in either language was $1.00 per year. At the close of the first year he had 1200 subscribers, and $30.00 in cash over and above his expenses. The first issue had four pages, measuring 10 x 15 inches, but with the April issue it was increased to eight pages. Beginning with January, 1867, the size of the page was changed to 9 x 12 inches, and the number of pages to 16. The circulation by that time had reached about 1500 English and 1000 German, and, figuring four to the average family, there would be approximately 6000 readers.

When his first year of publication closed, he sold his interest in the lumber business in order to devote all his time to the work of the church, through his publications. This meant no small sacrifice to himself, but, quoting from his own writings, he felt the Church needed a paper, and that the brotherhood would lend all assistance they could in increasing its circulation, which many also did. But it was not until the sixth day of April, 1867, on his 32nd birthday, that he moved to Elkhart, Indiana, where he rented the

front part of a basement and installed his own printing plant. He then purchased a vacant lot at what is now 320 South Main St., which was a sloping piece of timberland and underbrush. Soon he had it cleared off and commenced building. In addition to the equipment he brought from Chicago, which included a somewhat ancient type of lever press, he purchased a Taylor cylinder press, the first of this type of press to be installed in Elkhart, and which proved to be quite an innovation.

On New Year's day, 1868, the equipment was moved to the new building, which boasted four floors, though on account of the sloping lot, only two showed above the level of the street. One floor was for the store and office. The upper floor accommodated the type-setting room, editorial office, proof-reading room, ruling room, and stock room for unbound books. The basement contained the presses and printing stock and supplies, while the lower basement was used for storing boxes, paper cuttings, etc. Pending completion of the building, the store room was temporarily used as a private school room, and later as a convenient place to hold worship, as there was no meeting house in Elkhart until 1871. Of this we shall hear later.

In the fall of 1867 he was joined by his brother, Abraham K. Funk, and they conducted their business together under the name of John F. Funk and Brother until the spring of 1875, when they obtained a charter for 50 years, organizing under the name of Mennonite Publishing Company.

Of his activities in the publishing business, the *Elkhart Truth* of Dec. 27, 1924 had the following to say: "The venerable Rev. Funk, who celebrated his 89th birthday on the sixth of April last, enjoys not only the distinction of being the oldest man in Elkhart still active in business life, but also of having been here longest in continuous business, and also of having occupied the same stand for the longest period,—the dean of Elkhart business men. J. F. Funk has continued as the Company's President; and each day has found him at his desk in the Company's rooms, personally directing the business of the concern" . . . .

In 1908 the Company's printing business was sold to the James A. Bell Company. Earlier in the year a considerable portion of the printed books, as well as the periodicals, had been disposed of and transferred to the Mennonite Publishing House, at Scottdale, Penna. The *Herald of Truth* was merged with the *Gospel Witness,* under the name of *Gospel Herald,* and active publication of church literature was thereafter directed from Scottdale.

However, a very considerable portion of the books were not yet disposed of, so the business of reducing this stock was continued under the name of the Mennonite Publishing Company until the expiration of the Company's charter. Thus the *Elkhart Truth* further states: "The Company's original charter period of 50 years expires within a few months, and Mr. Funk hopes to be spared to establish another unique record. It is believed no man has, like he hopes to do, remained at the head of an Indiana corporation through the entire half century of its chartered existence."

He survived this period, and at the expiration of the charter, the business which had not in the meantime been transferred or sold, again reverted into the hands of the original organizer, and was thus continued under the name of John F. Funk, until the time of his death. This is a further touch of what is recognized as being indeed a unique record.

(To be continued)

THE LITERATURE AND HYMNOLOGY OF THE MENNONITES OF LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

HAROLD S. BENDER

It would be gratifying to be able to report that the earnest piety and well-grounded evangelical faith of the Mennonites of Lancaster County has found expression in a considerable body of religious literature. This has however not been the case. The Swiss and Palatine Mennonites of Europe had produced almost no religious literature before 1800, and those who emigrated to Pennsylvania in the 18th Century therefore brought little of their own literature with them. This was still more true of the Swiss who came to Lancaster County than of the Mennonites from Crefeld and Hamburg and the Palatinate, who came earlier to Germantown and Skippack in what is now called the Franconia district. They were not a literary people. The writings of Johann Arndt, a mystical German theologian of the 16th century (1555-1621), were popular among them, especially his *Wahres Christentum,* and *Paradies-Gaertlein.* Among the Palatinate Mennonites the writings of Gottfried Arnold (1666-1714) also were widely read. The writings of Menno Simons and Dirk Philips were apparently not much read in South Germany and Switzerland until the 18th Century, and were not introduced among the Pennsylvania Mennonites until 1794 (Menno Simons' *Fundamentbuch* published at Germantown) and 1811 (Dietrich Philips' *Handbuechlein* published at Lancaster). And then it is doubtful whether Dietrich Philips' or even Menno Simons' writings circulated much among the Mennonites proper, although both authors were very popular among the Amish Mennonites. The small stock of books brought along from Europe by the immigrants was chiefly of non-Mennonite character.

The very first indigenous American publication in which the Lancaster Mennonites were concerned was the English translation of the Dordrecht Confession of Faith published by Andrew Bradford in 1727 in Philadelphia. The publication of this confession was ordered by a representative conference of bishops and ministers of the Pennsylvania Mennonite settlements which met at Germantown in 1725. To the *Confession* proper was added an *Appendix* consisting of *A Defence of the Non-Resistant Faith,* translated

from the Dutch, and an *Excusation of Menno Simons,* likewise translated from the Dutch. The representatives of Lancaster (Conestoga as it was then called) who signed the booklet, thereby acknowledging the confession as accepted by the Mennonite churches of Pennsylvania, were Hans Burkholder, Christian Herr, Benedict Hershey, Martin Baer, and Johannes Bowman. This signature makes this book in a sense an official publication of the Lancaster Mennonites together with the Franconia group who also signed the confession. A preface to this book makes it clear however that it was intended to be read by their English-speaking neighbors, and not by the German-speaking Mennonites themselves. It was designed to correct misapprehensions of the nature of the Mennonite faith which seem to have constantly pursued the Mennonites of that time as well as those of our modern day.

Probably the first book published for the Lancaster Mennonites alone was an interesting volume with the attractive title of *Gueldene Aepfel in Silbernen Schalen* (*Golden Apples in Silver Bowls*). The book had been published in South Germany or Switzerland in 1702 and 1742. It was a small book of over 500 pages, divided into seven parts, containing the letters and confessions of several early Mennonite martyrs such as Michael Sattler, Thomas von Imbroich, Susanna von Holtz and Matthias Cervaes, together with the Dordrecht Confession of Faith of 1632, a collection of prayers, and finally a treatise on Christian song. The book was printed in Ephrata in 1745 by the Seventh Day Baptist Cloister press, but "published by several members of the Mennonite Church", as the title-page states. It is uncertain whether these "members" were from the Lancaster or Franconia districts.

Another booklet which was printed at a very early date, in fact in the same year and at the same place as the *Gueldene Aepfel,* was the prayerbook known as *Die Ernsthafte Christenpflicht* (*The Earnest Christian's Duty*), printed by the Ephrata Cloister Brotherhood press in 1745. It was a small booklet of 166 pages, containing a collection of prayers, together with the Dordrecht Confession, and some slight additional material. The origin of this booklet is obscure. A European edition was printed in Switzerland or the Palatinate about 1750, so that it is probably of earlier European origin. The book was very popular, and almost every home possessed a copy, since it contained the confession of faith in addition to the catechism. It was reprinted at Ephrata in 1770, 1785, and 1808, and at Lancaster seven times from 1826 to 1892. Ten other editions were published at various places, the latest being

that of 1924 at Scottdale, Pennsylvania. Bishop Benjamin Eby no doubt arranged for the edition of 1846, which was published at Berlin (now Kitchener), Ontario. In late years the use of the book has been confined almost exclusively to the Amish branch, but the record of editions in Lancaster County surely indicates that it was in widespread use among Lancaster Mennonites for about a century and a half.

Another booklet of similar widespread use was the catechism which came into use about the time of the Revolutionary War. It was called *Christliches Gemuethsgespraech* (*Christian Conversation on Saving Faith*), a small booklet of 168 pages first printed by the Ephrata Cloister press in 1769. The book consisted of a large catechism of 148 questions and answers, a small catechism of 35 questions and answers, the Dordrecht Confession of Faith, and *A Defense of the Non-Resistant Faith.* The book was written in 1702 by Gerrit Roosen, the noted Mennonite preacher and author of Hamburg-Altona, in North Germany. The popularity of this, the only catechism for the youth used by the Mennonites of America during the first century of their settlement here, is evidenced by the fact that it went through fifteen editions in German and English, the latest being the English edition published by J. W. Weaver at Union Grove, Lancaster County, in 1921. In earlier times this booklet was given to every candidate for baptism. Editions appeared at Ephrata in 1769, 1770; at Lancaster in 1811, 1836, and 1869, and at the same place four times in English between 1857 and 1892. Bishop Benjamin Eby was no doubt responsible for two editions at Berlin, Ontario, 1839 and 1846.

Another very interesting and thoroughly Mennonite book published at Ephrata on the Cloister press, was the *Maertyrer-Spiegel* or *Martyrs' Mirror,* which appeared in 1748, as a handsome folio volume of 1482 pages. Although this edition was arranged for by a committee of leaders from the Franconia district, whose leader was the noted Bishop Heinrich Funck, it was widely sold throughout the Lancaster district. This notable book was composed of two parts, the first dealing with accounts of the death of Christian martyrs in the early Christian centuries, together with confessions of faith, and the second and much longer containing authentic records of Mennonite martyrs in Switzerland, South Germany, Austria and Tyrol, North Germany and Holland, together with various Mennonite Confessions of Faith. The book had appeared in two Dutch editions of 1660 and 1685. It was translated and published for the Pennsylvania Mennonites primar-

ily as a book of inspiration to fortify the faith of the younger generation in non-resistance. The elders of the church were fearful lest the war-spirit of the French and Indian Wars just then in progress would infect the Mennonite youth and lead to a loss of principle.

A splendid edition of the German *Martyrs' Mirror* was published by Joseph Ehrenfried at Lancaster in 1814. In 1837, I. Daniel Rupp, a noted Pennsylvania historian, translated the *Martyrs' Mirror* into English. This edition was published by David Miller of near Lampeter Square, Lancaster County, and printed in Lancaster City.

John F. Funk of Elkhart, Indiana, provided the only additional English and German editions of this great book. The German edition appeared in 1870, published by the firm of John F. Funk and Brother, while the English edition appeared in 1886, published by the Mennonite Publishing Company.

A tribute was paid to the Ephrata German edition of 1745 by the Mennonites of the Palatinate in Germany, who issued a reprint of the Ephrata edition at Pirmasens, Germany in 1780.

A very popular and yet rather strange Mennonite book which was introduced among the Pennsylvania Mennonites as early as 1763, was the book known as *Die Wandlende Seele* or *The Wandering Soul,* first printed at Germantown in 1763. This book was introduced from Germany, although it first appeared (in smaller form) in Holland in 1635 as the product of a noted Dutch Mennonite preacher and author, Johann Philip Schabalie. This strange book gives a summary of world history from the creation to the destruction of Jerusalem in the form of dialogues between a *Wandering Soul* and Adam, Noah, and Simon Cleophas, which fill a moderately sized book of about 500 pages. It was apparently widely read by non-Mennonite readers as well as Mennonites. It has gone through 17 German and 5 English editions, the last being the German edition of 1919 at Scottdale. It is still very popular among the Amish. It might be interesting to note that the first edition of 1763 states that the translator of the book from Dutch into German was a certain B.B.B. while the publisher of the second English edition of 1834, I. Daniel Rupp, states that this B.B.B. was Bernhart B. Brechbill. It seems probable that this was but a guess by Rupp, and that he must have meant Benedict Brechbill, the noted Swiss Mennonite immigrant preacher of Lancaster County who arrived in 1717 from Switzerland and died shortly afterwards in 1720. It is indeed possible that Benedict Brechbill

(Brackbill) was the translator, and that he did the translating in Switzerland or Germany before coming to this country.

The official protest of November 7, 1775, against military service, addressed to the Colonial Government and Assembly of Pennsylvania by Mennonites and Dunkers, should also be mentioned here although it is not strictly a piece of literature. The petition was presented to the Assembly in manuscript, but also printed in both German and English as a broadside, apparently for distribution among the members of the Assembly and officials of the government. A later reprint of this petition carries the signature of a certain Benjamin Hershey, probably of Lancaster County, as the author.

Throughout the entire first century of Lancaster Mennonite History, no original literature was produced by the group. In fact, the only original writings by any American Mennonite during this period were the two books by Bishop Heinrich Funck of Franconia, *Ein Spiegel der Taufe,* of 1744, and the *Restitution,* of 1763, both of which were not widely circulated in Lancaster County. But even in the second century of Lancaster history, and down to recent times, very little original literature in book form has been produced by Lancaster Mennonites.

There was however one splendid little booklet written by Bishop Christian Burkholder, (in 1809), a very able and beloved bishop of the Weaverland-Groffdale district, which has enjoyed a very wide circulation down to the present day. The booklet by Burkholder is called *Nuetzliche und Erbauliche Anrede an die Jugend, von der Wahren Busse, vom Seligmachenden Glauben an Christo Jesu, und der reinen Liebe zu Gott und seinem Naechsten, und dem Gehorsam des Wort Gottes und der reinen Uebergabe der Seelen an Seine Hand, vorgestellt in Fragen und Antworten.* Translated into English the title reads *Useful and Edifying Address to the Young on True Repentance, Saving Faith in Christ Jesus, Pure Love to God and Our Neighbor, Obedience to the Word of God and a Full Surrender of the Soul into His Hands, in Questions and Answers.* It was first printed in 1804 as a large booklet of 39 pages, reprinted the same year at Ephrata, accompanied by several appendices, chief of which was the Small Catechism of 35 questions and answers taken from the *Gemuethsgespraech,* and again at Allentown in 1829. In 1839 the *Anrede* was attached to the Berlin edition of the *Gemuethsgespräch* as an *Appendix* and appeared in the various German and English editions of that booklet.

It is worthwhile to devote some time to this little booklet. In his "Foreword" the author describes the occasion for the composition of the writing. Conditions had become quite bad in the Church, he says, most of all due to the fact that each one criticized his brother, rather than considering the condition of his own heart. The author felt that more could be done by careful instruction of the youth in basic Christianity, than in working on the old "worn-out field" of the older members. Having expressed himself on this matter to his congregation, he was encouraged to prepare a treatise on the faith, based on the old Confession of Faith, but adapted to current needs. This he did to the general satisfaction of his people. The "Foreword" is dated February 21, 1792. It appears that the booklet was not immediately published in 1792, but was probably used for a time by its author, Bishop Burkholder, in his catechetical instruction. Finally however the Conference felt the need of having this splendid and useful statement of faith printed for use by the entire district. This was done by order of the Conference in 1804, and a preface was written for the publication, signed in the name of the entire Church by 27 ministers and deacons. Unfortunately the printer saw fit to omit these names, so that this valuable list of the members of the Lancaster Conference in 1804 has not been preserved for later historians.

The booklet is written in a very earnest and loving tone, full of rich admonition to the youth on the fundamentals of the Christian faith, abundantly supported with quotations and references from the Scriptures. The First "Address" is devoted to Repentance, the second to "Saving Faith," the "Love of God", and "Love of One's Neighbor". The Third Address, dealing with "Obedience to the Word of God and a Full Surrender of the Soul into His Hands," is couched in the form of 24 questions and answers divided into four "Instructions." A final paragraph deals with "Warning against Backsliding." The entire booklet is well-written, full of sound and practical teaching, and could be read to-day with profit. Possibly the publication of it in a convenient and attractive form would promote its circulation.

Another original writing of this time was the small booklet entitled *Auslegung der Wahren Taufe Jesu Christi, Nebst einer Vermahnung an Alte und Junge* (*Exposition of the True Baptism of Jesus Christ, Together with an Admonition to Old and Young*). It was written by preacher Melchior Brenneman of Conoy township in his 82nd year and published at Lancaster in 1808. This little booklet of 50 pages appeared in reply to an attack on Chris-

tian Burkholder's teaching on Baptism, contained in his *Anrede an die Jugend* of 1804. The attack is found in a booklet written by a Dunkard minister, Christian Langennecker, and published at Ephrata in 1806 under the title, *Eine Vertheidigung der Wahrheit, Wie die rechte Taufe von Christus an sein Jünger und Nachfolger befohlen wurde* (*A Defence of the Truth, How the True Baptism was Commanded by Christ to His Disciples and Followers.*)

According to Brenneman, this Dunkard booklet attacked Burkholder severely, and taught that all those who opposed immersion, and did not let the beard grow, were forerunners of the Anti-Christ. This charge naturally aroused faithful Mennonites, such as Brenneman, and called for a counter-defence. In the little pamphlet Brenneman discusses in detail the arguments of the Dunkard author, and proves that neither immersion nor the prohibition of the cutting of the beard is a New Testament teaching. He also discusses Dunkard and Mennonite history, and refutes the argument that the immersionists are the only true Christians, showing how the immersionists themselves are divided. It is interesting to note that apparently a number of Mennonites were being led to accept immersion, and that a body of them had left the Church some time earlier, but had not seen fit to join the Dunkards. This was no doubt the River Brethren Church. The booklet has no great value for instruction or inspiration, since it is primarily a polemical writing intended to meet an immediate need. It has however considerable historical value, throwing light on some of the problems which faced the Mennonite Church in Lancaster County in the days of the writer.

Who Brenneman was is not quite certain. Since he states that he was 82 years old in 1807, it is quite possible that he was the son of the immigrant preacher, Melchior Brenneman, who came to Lancaster in 1717. He was no doubt a preacher, or possibly even a bishop.

In 1824, a little booklet originally written by Anton Welck, the Mennonite preacher at Elbing, Germany, and printed there in 1788, was reprinted in Ephrata. The title is *Erweckung an das Herz der Jugend* (*Awakening Call to the Heart of Youth.*)

A Mennonite Preacher, Heinrich Nissley, according to the name very likely of Lancaster County, wrote a little devotional pamphlet or epistle, entitled *Geistliches Sendschreiben,* which was published for the first time in 1842 by Heinrich Eby, in Berlin, Ontario, as a small pamphlet of 20 pages. It was reprinted at

Skippackville, Montgomery County, Pa., in 1854. It is not altogether certain that Nissley was a Lancaster County preacher.

An interesting publication which was started about 1854 and which has been continued in modified form to the present date, is the so-called "Meeting Calendar." The first known issue of this Calendar appeared at West Earl, as a pamphlet of 14 pages, prepared by Abraham Martin. It bore the title, *Calendar of Mennonist Meetings in Lancaster County, Pa. for the year of our Lord 1854.* Whether this was the first one of the calendars is not known. The Ontario Meeting Calendar had been started in 1836, so it is possible that the Lancaster Calendar also existed earlier than 1854. Neither is it known whether the Meeting Calendar appeared annually after 1854 as it has for at least the past fifty years, since the meeting calendars are not serially numbered.

About 1870, Preacher Abraham Horst of Mount Joy, Lancaster County, wrote a letter to Ulrich Steiner, a prominent Mennonite bishop in Switzerland, after reading a booklet or a letter written by Steiner. The writing by Steiner was most likely the latter's *Angenehme Stunden in Zion,* published at Sonnenberg, Wayne County, Ohio in 1868. Abraham Horst was ordained at Hernley's congregation in 1868, and died in 1905. The letter is very short, and is printed in manuscript type. It deals chiefly with the doctrine of the nature of the Church, and has no great value.

An interesting and significant literary contribution by Lancaster Mennonites was the Sunday School Lesson Books compiled by a committee of the Lancaster Conference, composed of Jacob N. Brubacher, Isaac Eby, Amos Herr, and Benjamin Herr, together with John F. Funk of Elkhart, Indiana. The Primary and Intermediate Lesson Books appeared in 1880, and the Bible Class Question Book a year later. All were published by the Mennonite Publishing Co., at Elkhart, Indiana, and were widely used throughout the Church until the adoption of the Lesson Helps which made their way throughout the Church quite rapidly after their establishment in 1890. German editions of the Question Books were also issued.

In 1884 Bishop Jacob N. Brubacher compiled the *Brubacher Genealogy in America,* which was published in Elkhart in that year as a small volume of 243 pages.

In 1899 the Book and Tract Society, originally established at Elkhart, Indiana in 1892, moved its headquarters to Spring Grove, Pa., and Scottdale, Pa., after difficulties had arisen in its relations with the Mennonite Publishing Co., at Elkhart. John W.

Weaver was the active spirit in this work at Spring Grove, and inaugurated the *Book and Tract Messenger,* a four-page monthly periodical. However, the first number, which appeared in 1899, was also the last one. This was the only attempt at periodical publication in the Conference District until the *Missionary Messenger* was established in April, 1924, as a publication of the Eastern Mennonite Board of Missions and Charities. Orie Miller has been the editor of this periodical from the first number until last year. The paper has enjoyed an increasing circulation and has made a firm place for itself in the Conference District.

In recent years there has been an increased interest in historical study and publication, although little has been published in book or pamphlet form apart from the *Missionary Messenger.* M. G. Weaver, the historian of the Conference, published in 1925 a little pamphlet on the martyred superintendent of the Welsh Mountain Mission, A. T. Moyer, and in 1928 a *History of New Holland.* In 1931, his life-work as a historian was crowned with the publication of his history of the *Mennonites of Lancaster Conference.* The book is a veritable mine of valuable and reliable information about the history of the Mennonites in the conference district known as "Lancaster". A few family histories have also been compiled by members of the Church such as the family record of the Hess, Nissley and Eby Families. In addition non-members have written several family histories involving Mennonite families, such as the Herr, Landis, and Eby families. On the whole however, very little has been done on Lancaster County Mennonite family histories. This is an undeveloped but fruitful field.

The conference rules and regulations were first printed in 1881, and have since been published in revised form several times.

The Lancaster District might in a sense claim also the literary product of some of her sons and daughters who are now living outside its borders, such as the writings of A. D. Wenger, and J. A. Ressler. The editorial work of J. A. Ressler in Sunday School literature, as well as that of H. Frank Reist who was for 11 years editor of the *Christian Monitor,* and C. F. Yake, who has been the editor of the *Youth's Christian Companion* since its establishment, might also be credited to the Conference.

No church publishing house was ever established within the borders of the Lancaster district, although John W. Weaver at Union Grove, has occasionally published booklets, and has long conducted a bookstore with an extensive stock of new and second-hand books. In 1928 this stock was bought by the Mennonite Publishing House. The Bookstore is still managed by J. W. Weaver.

The literature which was used by the Mennonites in the district was published for the most part at Ephrata and Lancaster—at Ephrata until the Revolutionary War, and at Lancaster from the beginning of the 18th century. John Baer (later the firm of John Baer's Sons) was for practically the entire century almost exclusively the publisher of Mennonite catechisms, prayerbooks, confessions of faith, and hymnbooks. Joseph Ehrenfried tried for a time at the beginning of the 19th century to capture a part of the Mennonite publishing business, but failed. His greatest attempt was the beautiful edition of the German *Martyrs' Mirror,* which he published in 1814, but which is said to have caused his bankruptcy because of lack of sales and excessive cost. Since the establishment of the Mennonite Publishing House at Scottdale, and the decline of the firm of John Baer's Sons, practically all of the printing business and book purchases of the district have gone to the Mennonite Publishing House at Scottdale.

Hymnology

The Early Swiss and Palatine Mennonite immigrants to Lancaster brought with them the ancient Swiss Mennonite Hymnbook, the *Ausbund,* first published in 1564 in Switzerland. This hymnbook was in common use in the early days. An American edition of the book was soon needed, and was the first Mennonite book published in America for Mennonite use. It was published by Saur at Germantown in 1742, and again in 1751, 1767, and 1785. In 1815 it was first published in Lancaster, reappearing there a total of 8 times, the last in 1912. However, the *Ausbund* went out of use in the Mennonite congregations early in the 19th century. Since that time it has been used almost exclusively by the Amish of Lancaster, Mifflin and adjoining counties. In fact it seems that even before the Revolutionary war, the Mennonite congregations began to use other hymnbooks, particularly that of the Reformed Church, which was called *Ambrosii Lobwasser's Neu-Vermehrtes Gesangbuch,* first published at Germantown in 1753, with a second edition at the same place in 1763. A number of clean, unused copies of the 1763 edition of this Reformed hymnbook were recently found by the author in the attic of the Groffdale Mennonite Church, apparently having been in the possession of the congregation since they were first bought back in that early day a hundred and seventy years ago. That various non-Mennonite hymnbooks, in particular the Reformed, as well as the old *Ausbund,* were used as late as the turn of the century, 1800, is indicated

by a letter written by Deacon Martin Mellinger to relatives in Germany. Mellinger was deacon at what is now called Mellinger's church, and an outstanding leader. In a letter written in 1821 (reprinted in translation in the MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW for January, 1931, page 57 ff.) Mellinger tells about conditions which led to the preparation and publication of an official Lancaster Mennonite hymnbook. Mellinger describes the attempt made to prepare a hymnbook in coöperation with the Franconia representatives. After failure to agree, each district published its own book. For the sake of the interest it brings to an otherwise somewhat dry story, the account of this episode by Martin Mellinger is here given in full.

"And now I want to tell you how it went when the first book was to be printed. Since we had all sorts of hymnbooks, the old Swiss songbooks and Reformed hymnbooks, and not enough of what we had, our brethren decided to have a hymnbook printed for ourselves. Brethren and choristers were to select beautiful and fitting hymns, after which they were to be collected and given over to 3, 4, or 5 men. These men were to select enough out of the hymns which had been collected so that the hymnbook would not be too large. After a time two Skippack brethren came together with two of our leading bishops in my house to examine the hymns which had been collected. The Skippack brethren, since they have a large and strong church as well as a large district and are well-trained in singing, had brought together enough hymns for a complete hymnbook and had 3,000 subscriptions in advance. We also had many hymns from Virginia, from Jacob's Creek, and from our vicinity, which were to go into the book. So it was feared that the book would become too large. In addition our brethren wanted to include a number of psalms and notes. In short, the difference was so great that the Skippack brethren said that their hymns had been handed in by so many brethren and dared not be omitted, and so many had already subscribed, and there was a lengthy discussion. The second day the Skippack brethren said that they were only delegates, and they saw no other way than to have their book printed in Germantown where they had a good printer and bookbinder, which was so handy for them that they could look after everything, and we could print ours in Lancaster. And so the outcome was that they had as many printed as we. But that made no difference to us or them, for we love one another, and we visit them and they visit us every year. And still it is a pity that it had to be so. For many years already, many families have been moving to

Virginia, Jacob's Creek, and Canada, and each has his hymnbook, and then they have different hymnbooks when they come together. Although you will doubtless know most of the hymns in the books, you will probably find many beautiful and valuable hymns, especially in the last appendix, which are strange to you and have never yet appeared in print."

The first edition of the Lancaster hymnal, called the *Unparteyisches Gesangbuch,* was published at Lancaster in 1804 as a good-sized book of 511 pages. It contained two parts, first the Psalms set to music, and second a selection of 390 hymns. Later editions added considerable additional hymns in the form of appendices. The compiling committee states that the hymns were selected from various sources, and expressly states that several were selected from the martyr hymns of the earlier church hymnal, meaning by this the *Ausbund.* This hymnal went through fourteen editions from 1804 to 1883. Mellinger states that the earlier editions were for 4,000 copies each. The hymnal was also published again in 1923 in a special edition, apparently for the Old Order branches in Lancaster which still use the book. The hymnal also seems to have been used in Southwestern Pennsylvania, in Ontario, and in Virginia, at least for a time.

The widely used small and handy volume of English Hymns without notes which had been first published by the Virginia Mennonite Church at Harrisonburg in 1847, was reprinted by John Baer's Sons in Lancaster in 1862. This indicates its widespread use there at this early date. Two other editions were published by Baer's in 1864 and 1869. After this time the Lancaster Churches no doubt bought their English Hymnbooks from John F. Funk and his Mennonite Publishing Co., in Elkhart, Indiana. The Virginia English Hymnbook was called, *A Collection of Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Tunes.* In 1880 Funk changed the name to *A Collection of Hymns,* but kept on publishing substantially the same hymnbook, which he had bought from its Virginia publishers in 1868. As more advanced hymnals were introduced, containing notes, the Lancaster Churches on the whole followed the usage of the church at large. First came the *Hymns and Tunes,* published in 1890 at Elkhart, then the *Church and Sunday School Hymnal,* which appeared in 1902, *Life Songs* as a Sunday School hymnal in 1916, and the new *Church Hymnal, Mennonite,* in 1927.

It would be of interest to know the kind of German Bible which was used by the Lancaster Mennonites in the early days. The Swiss and Palatine Mennonites, in particular the Amish Mennonites of Alsace, long preferred the early Swiss German trans-

lation known as the "Froschouer" Bible, which first appeared in complete form in 1529, antedating the Martin Luther Bible by several years. This Bible received its name from its original publisher, Christoffel Froschouer in Zurich, Switzerland. It is difficult to know, however, how much this Bible was maintained in use by the early settlers, since it was doubtless difficult to secure. All the early German Bibles in the colonies had to be imported until Christopher Saur in Germantown began to publish the German Bible in the Luther Translation. The Mennonites in the Franconia district patronized Saur and bought his Bibles. Most of the congregations in that district early bought or received as gifts copies of his Bible which were put into the meeting houses, where they are still to be found in several churches. The first edition of Saur's Bible appeared in 1743, the second in 1763, the third in 1776. No doubt the Lancaster Mennonites also used these Bibles. In 1787 an edition of the Froschouer New Testament was published at Ephrata by the Cloister Press, although it is possible that this was published chiefly for the Amish branch. In 1819 John Baer published a very large and beautifully printed German Luther Bible, which was sold by subscription. So many Lancaster County Mennonite subscribers are listed in the list of subscribers that it has been called by some writers, the "Mennonite Bible".

In closing this discussion, a few words might be said about the literature used by the Amish of Lancaster and adjoining counties. No doubt the various editions of Menno Simons *Fundamentbuch* which appeared in Lancaster in 1835, 1853, and 1876, and in English at Allentown in 1849, Lancaster in 1835, 1863, and 1869 were read chiefly by the Amish, yet they may also have been widely distributed among the Mennonites. Dietrich Philips' *Enchiridion,* published at New Berlin, Pa., in 1851, 1857, also at Lancaster in 1811, was quite certainly primarily for Amish consumption, as were the Lancaster editions of 1830 and 1871 of Wilhelm Wynantz' *Predigten,* and the Allentown edition of 1835 of Johannes Deknatel's *Predigten.* Wynantz had been preacher at the Mennonite Church in Hamburg-Altona about 1650, while Deknatel was a Dutch Mennonite preacher in Amsterdam, (died 1759). The Amish continued to use the old Swiss hymnal, the *Ausbund,* or another smaller and more modern hymnal called *Eine Unparteyische Liedersammlung,* first published in Lancaster in 1860. In general it can be said that there was no fellowship and no community of interest between the Amish and the Mennonites, so that there was probably very little transfer of literature between the two groups.

THE RISE AND EARLY HISTORY OF THE SWISS BRETHREN CHURCH

I. The Rise of State Church Protestantism

John Horsch

The dissenters of the reformation period—principally the so-called Anabaptists with the exception of the followers of John of Leiden who constituted an intolerant, persecuting state church—have been rightly called the step-children of Christendom. Protestant church historians have for centuries looked upon the Anabaptists as fanatics who without adequate reasons refused to make common cause with the leading reformers. A noted Protestant historian, Johann Heinrich Kurtz, in a widely used text book of church history, treated the history of the Anabaptists under the caption "The Deformation of the Church," classing them in point of orthodoxy beneath Romanism. While the question of the reasons for the separation of state church Protestantism from the Roman Catholic Church has often been adequately treated by Protestant writers, the causes for the withdrawal of the dissenters from state church Protestantism have on the whole failed to receive impartial consideration. In the study of the doctrine and history of the dissenters the primary sources, that is to say, their own writings and oral expressions, have been given but scant attention. A striking evidence of this—one among many—is found in the fact that one of the most important sources for the doctrine of the Swiss Brethren—the records of the great disputation held in March, 1538, in Bern—has been used by none of the authors of works on the Swiss Brethren nor by the writer of any important article on the subject. On the other hand, the writings and pertinent statements of the bitterest opponents and persecutors of the Brethren have been too carelessly used and their reliability taken for granted. In consequence certain unfounded opinions were advanced concerning the differences in doctrine and practice between the dissenters and state church Protestantism. The Swiss Brethren movement was born of the earlier general reformation movement, more particularly of the Zwinglian movement. The earliest church fathers of the Swiss Brethren withdrew from Zwingli's leadership when he seriously modified his earlier reformation program and in consequence also his doctrinal position on various points. The

study of the history of the Swiss Brethren necessarily includes due consideration of their reasons for withdrawing from state church Protestantism; hence the development and early history of state church Protestantism naturally claims the attention of the student of the history of the Swiss Brethren.

The reformation is the great general movement away from Romanism and back to the Scriptures in which Martin Luther (1483-1546), Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531), and somewhat later John Calvin (1509-1564) were the principal leaders. Before the beginning of the Lutheran and Zwinglian reformation movements Western Christendom (that is, the church in the countries of central and western Europe) was Roman Catholic, excepting the small denominations of the Waldenses and Bohemian Brethren which had maintained their existence despite all persecution. Church and state were united in all countries. The population of every country was compelled by the civil powers to profess the creed established by the state, that is the Roman Catholic creed. Persistent dissent, or deviation from Romanism, was punishable by death.

Martin Luther was born in 1483 at Eisleben, in Saxony, a province of the German Empire. He was educated in the Latin school at Eisenach and the University of Erfurt. In 1505 he entered the Augustinian Convent in Erfurt and became a monk hoping to find peace of conscience through self-imposed penance of varied description. After years of vain effort to find assurance of salvation he was finally led to see that divine forgiveness and a change of heart are the result of faith in Christ and surrendering to Him. In 1509 he accepted a call to a professorship in the University of Wittenberg in Saxony.

In 1517 the notorious John Tetzel was commissioned to sell indulgences in certain parts of Germany. Luther believed that Tetzel claimed too much for the efficacy of the indulgences, and that in this respect he acted contrary to the Roman Catholic creed and to the will of the Pope. In consequence Luther wrote ninety-five theses, or paragraphs, in Latin, on indulgences, and affixed them to the door of the castle church in Wittenberg. In these theses he condemned the abuses of which he believed Tetzel to be guilty from the Roman Catholic point of view. However, in the course of the controversy which ensued, Luther became more and more convinced that various teachings and practices of Romanism are unscriptural. Even before writing the ninety-five theses he had de-

fended ideas on the doctrine of justification by faith which, from the Roman Catholic viewpoint, were heretical. His sovereign, the elector or ruler of Saxony, Frederick the Wise, gave him all possible protection.

Luther was finally excommunicated by the pope in 1520. Having received a copy of the papal bull of excommunication, he treated it with contempt and burned it publicly. In the following year he appeared before the *Reichstag* (diet) of the German Empire, at Worms, and refused to make the recantation which was asked of him. Elector Frederick secretly arranged for him to retire to Wartburg Castle in the interest of his safety. During his sojourn of nearly a year in this castle, Luther made the important decision that the reformation of the church in Saxony and other states whose rulers were friendly toward the reformation movement must be undertaken only with the consent of the rulers.

Luther made this decision for obvious reasons. He realized that if the leaders of the reformation proceeded independently of the state, and if the civil authorities permitted them to do so, such a course would result in the separation of church and state. In that case various creeds would be tolerated by the state, and the Lutheran creed naturally would be accepted by only those whom Luther and his assistants would win by teaching and persuasion. Now, Elector Frederick the Wise was known to have conscientious objections to the use of force in religious things. However, his brother, Duke John, who succeeded Frederick as elector in May, 1525, had no such scruples. He would not have given consideration to the idea of a separation of church and state. Had Luther insisted on the independence of the church from state control, the protection enjoyed by him and his followers in Saxony would have come to an abrupt end with the beginning of the rule of Elector John, and persecution for Lutheranism would have set in.

In Wartburg castle Luther wrote the booklet *A Faithful Admonition*,[1] in which, contrary to his former reformation program, he defended the view that, as concerns the actual reformation of religious forms and practice, the civil government alone has the right of initiative. He addressed his followers in this manner:

> Therefore be guided by the civil authorities. As long as the authorities do not take the matter in hand and give orders, you should stand still with hand, mouth, and heart, and should not do anything. If you can influence the government to act and give

[1] Weimar edition of Luther's Works, VIII, pp. 676-688; Erlangen edition, XXII, pp. 43-59.

> orders, you may do so. If the government is not willing to do something, neither should you be. But if you proceed notwithstanding, you are in the wrong and are much worse than the other party [the Romanists].[2]

Such an attitude naturally meant a perpetuation of the union of church and state. The mass was finally abolished in Wittenberg in May, 1525, by Elector John, the heir and successor of Elector Frederick. The Lutheran church was made the state church in various provinces of Germany and in the Scandinavian countries, while the Zwinglian or Reformed Church was made the state church of certain cantons of Switzerland.

Ulrich (or Huldreich) Zwingli was the leader in the general reformation movement in the German speaking parts of Switzerland, and the founder of the Reformed church. From the Mennonite viewpoint the history of the Swiss reformation movement is of particular interest, since for a number of years the fathers of the Swiss Brethren or Mennonite church were identified with it.

Switzerland, it may be noted in passing, was a confederation of a number of cantons, or states, each of which was governed by a senate, or council. The Council of Zurich consisted of two "houses," the Upper and Lower Council, numbering about 200 members in all. The Swiss states were united in a central government.

Ulrich Zwingli was born in 1484 at Wildhaus near St. Gall in Switzerland. He was educated in Bern, Vienna, and Basel, and was consecrated a priest of the Roman Catholic church in 1506. At Einsiedeln he preached in 1518 against abuses in the sale of indulgences. In the same year he was elected headpastor of the city of Zurich, the capital of the canton Zurich and largest city of Switzerland. Zwingli was the most prominent priest of this city and was under obligation to say mass regularly, but became gradually estranged from Romanism. A distinctly evangelical note became apparent in his preaching. He showed that certain Romish usages and practices are unscriptural.

The first important deviation from Roman Catholic usages on the part of those who took Zwingli's teaching seriously took place some time during Lent of 1522. A number of Zurichers, among them the printer Christoffel Froschouer, held a social gathering in which they transgressed the prohibition of eating meat. Zwingli was present but did not partake of meat. The Council of Zurich

---

[2] Erlangen edition, XXII, p. 49.

protested against this violation of ecclesiastical law. The attitude of the council toward the reformation movement was decidedly favorable, but the Swiss central government strongly opposed the movement. Motivated by the desire to appease the central government and to satisfy the strong Catholic minority in Zurich, the Council of Zurich chose to take an attitude of compromise. They gave the priests orders to preach only what they could substantiate by Scripture, thus giving them full liberty to preach Zwinglian doctrine. At the same time the council prohibited all deviation from Roman Catholic practice. The plain fact is that although the priests of the city and canton Zurich preached against Romanism for years and Zwingli himself denounced the mass as blasphemy against God, the state church of Zurich discarded Romanism only with the abolition of the mass, on a later date.

To advance the cause of the reformation the Council of Zurich decided to arrange a disputation between the friends and opponents of the reformation movement. The disputation, principally a debate between Zwingli and Johann Faber, the vicar-general of the bishop of Constance, was held January 23, 1523. Zwingli showed clearly that certain Roman Catholic teachings are unscriptural.[3] In a second disputation arranged by the Council of Zurich and held October 26-28, of the same year, only a weak Roman Catholic representation was present. The subject of the discussions was the question of abolishing the mass and the images. Zwingli, in this disputation, urged the need for these reforms, but the council did not give the desired permission to abolish the mass until about a year and a half later, in April, 1525. It was only then that the mass, the most characteristic feature of Roman teaching and practice, was abolished and the Reformed creed established by the civil authorities of Zurich. And not only was the mass forbidden at that date in the Canton Zurich, but attending mass in adjoining Roman Catholic territory also was somewhat later declared unlawful and threatened with punishment. A number of the German speaking states of Switzerland, including the large cantons of Zurich and Bern, accepted the Zwinglian creed, while other cantons remained steadfast in the Roman Catholic faith. Zwingli died in 1531 in battle in a war between the Reformed (or Zwinglian) and the Catholic cantons.

---

3 An English translation of the Acts of the first Zurich Disputation was published in *Selected Works of Huldreich Zwingli*, edited by Samuel Macauley Jackson, Philadelphia, 1901, pp. 40-171.

The principal point of difference between Luther and Zwingli was regarding the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Luther defended the doctrine of the Real Presence, that is to say, the view that the bread and "the fruit of the vine" are the body and blood of Christ, while Zwingli considered them emblems or symbols. Zwingli, it is important to observe, ascribed his views on the ordinances of Christ, in so far as he differed on this point from Luther, to the influence of the Swiss Brethren, as will be further indicated.

The reformation movement resulted in the separation of a number of countries from the Roman Church. However, as already indicated, this movement, as led by Luther and Zwingli, did not result in the separation of church and state, nor in the establishment of churches in which membership was voluntary. The rulers, or civil authorities, who accepted the Lutheran or Zwinglian creed, undertook the establishment of Protestant state churches in their respective states or territories. The whole population was compelled by the rulers to consider themselves members of the state churches. The rulers tolerated among their subjects no dissent from their own creed. In every state a nominal unity of faith was enforced by the civil authorities. This involved the persecution of the dissenters (principally the so-called Anabaptists). The people in general, rather than endure persecution, professed the prescribed creed, whether or not they personally believed it to be scriptural. Hence, generally speaking, the population of Protestant provinces was either Lutheran or Zwinglian throughout. Creedal and ecclesiastical boundaries were identical with the political boundaries of the provinces, or states.

However, the establishment of state churches and of a union of church and state was not included in the original reformation programs of Luther and Zwingli. In the earlier years of their reformatory efforts they defended the principle of voluntary church membership and of the independence of the church from state control.[4] Among Zwingli's emphatic statements on this point are the following, taken partly from a booklet written in June, 1523:

> One should not ask the government in such matters, for the civil authorities are not ordained to rule over the Word of God and Christian liberty, but only over things that are of a secular nature, as I have abundantly shown above. So we readily see that the

[4] This is now generally admitted by church historians. Cf. Professor Walter Koehler's statement, *Zwingli's Works* IV, p. 29, also Professor Hermelink, *Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte,* XXIX, pp. 267ff.

authority which the government has over our bodies and temporal possessions does not extend over the soul.[5] Whenever the civil authorities command that which is contrary to the divine truth, or forbid that which is in accordance with it, they who believe the Word of God must suffer death rather than yield. If they fail to do this, they are not the followers of Christ.[6] The minister shall be chosen [not by civil authorities but] by the congregation or parish in which he is to preach. For the congregation, and no one else, shall judge concerning the doctrines which he holds.[7] If the pastor be false and the whole parish recognizes his unsoundness, he should be dismissed by a unanimous vote. If this cannot be done, you should unitedly refuse to hear him. You should suffer death rather than to hear such a shepherd.[8]

Similar expressions could be quoted from Martin Luther's early writings. In the year 1523 he wrote a booklet having the following title: *Proof and Demonstration from the Scriptures that a Christian Congregation or Church has the Right and Authority to Judge All Doctrine and to Call, Ordain and Depose Ministers.*[9] However, at the time when Luther wrote this booklet he had already under the pressure of circumstances taken steps which led inevitably to a union of church and state. In theory he always disapproved of the principle of state control for the church but in reality he consented to it. It was through obvious compromise that both Luther and Zwingli permitted the establishment of churches in which the whole population, sinner as well as saint, was compelled by the civil authorities to hold membership. By this union of church and state the outward success of the reformation movement was assured in all countries whose rulers were won for the Lutheran or Zwinglian creed. Thus the task of the reformers was immeasurably lightened. Their task consisted chiefly in winning the rulers of any given country for the reformation movement. And it was to the civil rulers' personal advantage to embrace the reformation. To do so placed them in control of the church as an institution and of the wealth of the cloisters which they confiscated. In the Lutheran provinces and states every ruling prince was recognized as the *summus espiscopus* (supreme bishop) of the church in his state.

---

5 *Zwingli's Works,* II, p. 514f.

6 *Ibid.,* II, p. 503.

7 *Ibid.,* III, p. 78.

8 *Ibid.,* III, p. 64.

9 *Luther's Works,* Weimar, XI, pp. 408-416; Erlangen, XXII, pp. 141-151.

It has been indicated above that the people in general, with the exception of the dissenters who were comparatively few in number, commonly accepted the creed prescribed by the state. Martin Bucer, though a leader of Protestantism of the state church type, said on this point: "The orders of the civil ruler or burgomaster alone are followed [instead of Scripture], and instead of one pope there are now many popes, and this sort of thing is getting worse from day to day."[10] "Every one fashions his faith to please the authorities," said the chronicler Sebastian Franck, in 1531; "no one [excepting the dissenters] will bear persecution for his faith." In Switzerland and Germany the population of a number of territories and states changed their religious profession again and again upon the command of the rulers.

After the second war of Cappel (1531) certain districts in which Zwinglianism had been introduced by the civil authorities, came again under Roman Catholic governments, and the population of these districts re-accepted the Roman Catholic creed. The inhabitants of the Upper Palatinate were compelled to change their profession four times during the Reformation period. The last change was from the Lutheran to the Roman Catholic faith.[11] "Not less than seven times within a few decades," says J. R. Dieterich, "the population of Oppenheim changed their profession, being compelled to do so."[12] In the large territory of the Electorate of Cologne the population at large was exceptionally well prepared for the abolition of Romanism, and under Elector Herman von Wied, Protestantism was introduced; but through political complications the elector was deposed and his work annihilated. This territory has remained Roman Catholic to this day. The people in general, whether Protestant or Catholic, did not take their faith with sufficient seriousness to be willing to endure persecution for it. The number of Lutheran and Zwinglian martyrs after the rise of Protestant state churchism is exceedingly small. The dissenters complained bitterly that they were ridiculed for their willingness to suffer persecution for their faith.

The readiness with which the Roman Catholic population discarded their creed upon the command of the civil authorities is remarkable but is to be explained partly (at least in states where no sudden change was demanded by the rulers) by the fact that many

---

[10] Anrich, *Martin Bucer,* p. 125.

[11] Ockel, *Bayerische Geschichte,* p. 79.

[12] *Reformationsgeschichte von Oppenheim* in Beitraege zur hessischen Kirchengeschichte, II, p. 86.

were led to see things in a different light, having accepted instruction from Scripture. More surprising is the failure of the populace in the states in which Romanism had been discarded, to prize their new, improved creed more highly. The principal cause is doubtlessly found in the glaringly compromising character of Protestant state churchism. There is striking evidence that the earliest followers of Martin Luther were ready and determined to suffer for their faith, if need be. The decision of the leading reformers to be guided to a large extent by the desires of the civil authorities in the task of church reformation was fraught with pernicious consequences. This decision destroyed and crushed the purely evangelical spirit and enthusiasm which was in evidence in the first period of the reformation movement. Let us consider the situation at Wittenberg in 1521-22.

During Luther's sojourn in Wartburg castle the people of Wittenberg demanded the abolition of the mass. Luther had in his writings denounced the mass as an abomination and blasphemy against God. The people of Wittenberg, or a majority of them, felt its continued observance to be an offense. On December 10, 1521, they presented to the Council of Wittenberg an urgent petition to take steps in the way of a reformation of worship and practice. They demanded that henceforth no priest should be compelled to say mass and that in the observance of the Lord's supper the cup should not be withheld from the laity. They furthermore asked that all houses of ill fame and such drinking houses as offered the opportunity for intoxication should be closed. This petition of the people of Wittenberg also contained the significant statement that, *if the introduction of evangelical reforms would result in persecution* (by the state authorities) *they were willing to bear it and to give their goods and possessions, yea their lives for the evangelical truth.* Here, then, an attitude of earnestness and determination, a desire for a reformation of life as well as of doctrine, was in evidence, standing in strong contrast to the disheartening religious indifference of later periods.

Parenthetically it may be observed here that the mass is a chief foundation stone of Romanism. The idea of a literal priesthood, or a priestly class, in the Catholic Church, rests upon the supposition that the sacrifice of Calvary must be repeated by the priests in the mass. It is held that the bread, or host, in the Eucharist, is Christ's body in a literal sense, or, in other words, it is Christ himself and is to be worshiped. Christ is supposed to be offered up again whenever mass is said. The one great sacrifice

made once for all for sin is believed to be insufficient; the priests must offer up Christ afresh. To make sure of personal salvation people were advised to have masses said in their own behalf. Many created endowment funds the income of which was to be used for saying mass in order to shorten their time of punishment in purgatory after their departure.

Elector Frederick, the ruler of Saxony and patron of Luther, had given orders that no change in worship and practice should be made. However it was generally known that the elector had scruples against using coercion in religious things. Many were of the opinion that the elector would not insist on the restoration of the mass after it had once been abolished. It was also believed that Luther favored its abolition. True, he had some time previously said that no priest should change a word in the mass ritual (in other words, the parts of the mass which were objectionable should not be omitted), but more recently he had expressed himself to the effect that the mass should be abolished.

Professor Andreas Carlstadt, at that time Luther's friend and collaborator, finally decided to risk discarding the mass and other abuses. On Christmas day, 1521, he held a communion service in the parish church of Wittenberg in which various Romish usages were omitted and the cup as well as the host, or bread, was given all participants. On New Year's Day and the Sunday following the service was repeated, great numbers participating. The council of the town, in a mandate dated January 24, 1522, approved of these reforms and took steps toward the suppression of open immorality, ordering the punishment of transgressors. There were also well-appointed provisions made for the worthy poor.

The elector was displeased when he heard of the reforms undertaken in Wittenberg but did not immediately object. Soon however matters were complicated by political developments. Before the end of January, or within a week after the council had acted upon the recommendations of the people of Wittenberg, the elector received word that the imperial government (*Reichsregiment*) had published a mandate demanding that the changes from Roman Catholic worship and practice which had been enacted in Wittenberg and a few other places in Saxony, must be abandoned and the old forms restored. Three Roman Catholic bishops were commissioned to make themselves responsible for the abolition of these innovations. This was disquieting news for the elector. He had to choose between obeying this mandate or taking the consequences which would in any case be undesirable and might be of

serious nature. On February 17, 1522, he gave orders that the innovations made in Wittenberg must be discarded.

The magistrates of Wittenberg were thrown into consternation by this command of the elector. The population of the town on the whole had from sincere conviction demanded the abolition of Roman Catholic worship and practice. They had declared, as we have seen, that they were willing to endure persecution rather than to continue in the old forms and practices. In the face of these facts the magistrates of Wittenberg lacked the courage to undertake the restoration of Romanism. Naturally they turned their eyes toward the man who, they believed, could get the people's consent to the changes ordered by the elector. In all haste the magistrates dispatched a mounted courier to Wartburg castle urgently asking Luther to return immediately to Wittenberg.[13]

On the sixth day of March, 1522, Luther arrived in Wittenberg. He publicly disapproved the abolition of the mass and the other innovations introduced in the church. He demanded that the Roman Catholic forms must be restored and observed for some time longer. The people of Wittenberg acquiesced in these demands after Luther had preached eight sermons on eight successive days, defending these views.

In consequence, the scriptural forms of worship and practice which had been established in the parish church were again abolished. Mass was held in Latin with the observance of all the former ceremonies. The host, or consecrated bread was again elevated by the priest to be adored (worshiped), the congregation kneeling before it. Those who desired a communion service "in both kinds," that is, receiving the cup as well as the host, were to be granted this privilege on the condition that such a service should not be held in the church and not at the time when mass was said in the churches. However, the words in the ritual referring to the mass as a sacrifice could be omitted. These words were considered the most essential part of the mass; without them the service was in fact not a mass service. The words in question were always spoken by the priests in Latin in a low inaudible voice; therefore, as Luther himself says, the people would not notice the omission but would be under the impression that the mass was still observed. In this way, he says, offense on the part of the Romanists is avoided.[14]

The reasons which Luther gave for reestablishing the Roman Catholic forms of worship were set forth in the eight sermons al-

[13] Boehmer, H., *Luther im Lichte der neueren Forschung,* Fuenfte Auflage, p. 128.
[14] *Luther's Works,* Erlangen, XXVIII, p. 305.

ready mentioned which soon appeared in print. A few weeks later he published a booklet on the same subject.[15] In these sermons Luther censured the people of Wittenberg severely and repeatedly for having undertaken these innovations. For two reasons, he said, they had erred by introducing the practical reforms. First, these innovations had not been duly authorized, and secondly, they were untimely because there were yet those who, while favorably disposed toward a reformation of the church, had not fully discarded the Roman Catholic views on the points in question. To these he referred as "weak brethren." He said emphatically and repeatedly that, by introducing these reforms, the people of Wittenberg had offended the weak brethren as well as those "who are now our enemies" and who were yet to be won for evangelical views. And yet, not many months before, when Luther had received the news that the mass had been abolished in the private chapel of the Augustinian cloister in Wittenberg, he had written a booklet on the mass in which he expressed the hope that the offence for the Roman Catholic "Pharisees" would increase more and more and that everywhere the mass would be abolished. And in the same year (1521) he had advised the Elector that the mass should be forbidden by the civil authorities.

Now he asserted that the people of Wittenberg, by introducing such innovations, had sinned against Christian love. They had taken a correct attitude, he said, in faith and doctrine, but had failed in love. He ignored the above mentioned fact that he himself had shortly before expressed other views on the point in question. Neither had any one of his collaborators believed these reforms to be inconsistent with the requirements of Christian love. On the contrary, Luther's principal co-workers: Melanchthon, Carlstadt, Amsdorf, and Jonas, had on October 20, 1521, advised the elector that the mass should be abolished "even if the whole world were offended."

Since Luther censured the people of Wittenberg for abolishing the mass at this time, the question is in order, Had he changed his views regarding the objectionableness of the mass? Obviously not; he restated in these sermons and in the above mentioned booklet again his opinion that mass is sin and blasphemy and that it is necessary for the priests and for all men to reprove it as such. On November 27, 1522, he preached a sermon in which he again declared that mass is an abomination and blasphemy against

[15] *Von beiderlei Gestalt des Sacraments zu nehmen und anderer Neuerung.* Weimar edition, X, pp. 11-41; Erlangen, XXVIII, pp. 286-318.

God and is worse than sins of unchastity, murder, and larceny. While this was his view of the mass he nevertheless says, as we have seen, that "out of consideration for the weak and for others who may yet join us" the people of Wittenberg should for the time being have refrained from abolishing the mass and from making other innovations.

The eight sermons which Luther preached after his return from Wartburg castle were chiefly devoted to showing the necessity of "sparing (or having consideration for) the weak brethren" who must not be offended. From this time forward it was generally held by the leading German as well as the Swiss reformers that the need of "having regard for the weak" was sufficient reason for putting off practical reformation until such a time when the civil authorities were ready to take in hand the matter of discarding unscriptural practices.

For evidence that offense had been caused by the abolition of the mass and by following the more Scriptural way in the observance of communion, Luther stated that a number of persons, who had taken part in an evangelical communion service, afterwards confessed to a priest that they had sinned by doing so. This information came probably from the priests of the castle church who seem to have been successful, in a few instances, in persuading persons who had taken part in a Lutheran communion service, that a deviation from Roman Catholic practice is sinful. This then is an instance of persons who, having been won for evangelical views, again yielded to adverse influences which caused them to fall back. Luther's argument here is unsupportable. Since he denounced mass as sinful, it is clear that only to their own loss did "the weak" follow their erring conscience.

Again, it was insinuated by Luther that the abolition of Roman Catholic practices in Wittenberg involved a violation of the principle of liberty of conscience. But no one had been compelled to approve of the innovations that had been made in the parish church. Persistent Romanists had every opportunity to attend the Roman Catholic services in the castle church of the town.

Various writers have defended the opinion that the restoration of the Roman Catholic forms of worship by Luther is to be explained and excused on the supposition that some of the innovations made by Carlstadt and the Council of Wittenberg savored of radicalism. This supposition is without support. True, the so-called Zwickau Prophets held various radical and fanatical notions, but they came to Wittenberg only after they had received

word that the mass had been discarded by Carlstadt. Neither in his sermons nor in the booklet mentioned above, nor in the large book which later he wrote against Carlstadt (having the curious title, *Against the Celestial Prophets*[15a]) did Luther mention or allude to the peculiar views of these men of Zwickau.

If anything contrary to Scripture had been undertaken in Wittenberg in the way of innovations, Luther had every right to condemn and abolish it. However, he stated expressly and repeatedly that nothing had been undertaken that was contrary to Scripture, or wrong in itself.[16] Much has sometimes been made of the fact that when, on February 6, 1522, the images were removed from the parish church by order of the town Council, some of the pictures were destroyed contrary to the Council's desire. True, the persons concerned had not the right to destroy property that was not their own. Such deeds of iconoclasm, however, occurred in various places.

To what extent the Roman Catholic worship was restored in Wittenberg and a few other places where it had been abolished, is clear from Luther's own words. He wrote not long after his arrival from Wartburg castle in Wittenberg:

> In the first place it is needful to continue the old custom of saying mass in the Latin language with the sacerdotal vestments and chanting and all the customary ceremonies. . . . Secondly the priests who say mass must omit all the words which have reference to the sacrifice. . . . But it is easy for the priests to omit these words in such a way that the common people will never notice the omission; it can be done without offense. Yet the priests who are obdurate and will not omit these words may answer for themselves to God; they should also be tolerated. [17]

The images which had been taken from the church were, as far as possible, replaced. Luther made the remark that he had decided "to be weak with the weak" for some time. He advised the

---

[15a] *Wider die himmlischen Propheten.* Weimar edition, XVIII, pp. 62-214; Erlangen edition, XXIX, pp. 136-297. The title seems to imply that Carlstadt, in Luther's opinion, held the views of the Zwickau Prophets but, as just stated, the contents of the book do not bear out this supposition. It was insinuated that Carlstadt advised the students of the university of Wittenberg to go home and quit studying, and one of his friends, a teacher, asked the people of the town to take their children out of even the elementary schools. Such absurd statements do not deserve attention.

[16] *Ich sehe nichts sonderliches unrechts furgenommen on das der satanas hatt tzusehr auf die eyle drungen, die lieb wollen uberhupffen.* (I do not see that anything particularly out of place was undertaken, except that Satan was too urgent for immediate action, leaving love out of consideration). Weimar edition, X, p. 2; Erlangen edition, XXVIII, p. 307.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 304.

monks and nuns who had left the cloisters to return, and himself set them an example by moving back into the Augustinian cloister, resuming the cowl and observing the fasts. He desired that "having regard for the weak, in order not to offend them" should become popular in Wittenberg.

Both the Lutheran and Zwinglian reformers advised the priests to say mass "in appearance only," but the offense was none the less, since "the weak" were left under the impression that the priests, or ministers, did that which they themselves believed to be an abomination before God. The reformers deliberately closed their eyes to the plain fact that the evangelical portion of the population was gravely offended and discouraged by such unmistakable compromise. Many who had accepted the evangelical teaching obviously realized that their leaders were paying too great a price for securing the support of the civil government. The danger that the people would lose interest and become indifferent was very real. George Spalatin, a friend of Luther, in a letter to the Elector of Saxony[18] expressed the opinion that to keep up the Roman Catholic ceremonies was not really an act of love toward "the weak" but was hazarding their best interests and served in fact to offend them. He added that many who favored the gospel were also offended. Justus Jonas expressed himself similarly.[19] Andreas Carlstadt wrote a book on the point in question, having the title, *Ob man gemach fahren soll*[19a] ("Whether One Should Go Slowly," namely in abolishing the mass). He severely criticized the idea that doing that which is morally wrong can ever be to any one's real good. Wolfgang Wetter, a priest who in obedience to the Council of St. Gall continued to say mass though he preached against it, as bidden by the Council, objected to its further observance. He urged that the offense to the reform friends was a more serious matter than the displeasure of the Romanists.[20] Conrad Grebel referred to such compromises as acts of "diabolical prudence." He pointed out that by such a time-serving attitude "God's Word is turned upside down, thrust back, fettered;" in other words, the authority of Scripture is in practice denied.[21]

---

18 *Mitteilungen der Geschichts und Altertumsgesellschaft des Osterlandes,* VI, 1886, p. 119f.

19 *Corpus Reformatorum,* I, p. 631.

19a *Ob man gemach fahren und dem Aegernisse der Schwachen verschohnen solle in Sachen so Gottes Willen angehen.* Reprinted by Fuessli, *Beytraege zur Erlaeuterung der Kirchen-Reformations-Geschichten des Schweitzerlandes,* I, pp. 57-142.

20 Kessler, J., *Sabbata,* 1902, p. 204.

21 *Vadianische Briefsammlung,* III, p. 50.

Luther himself intimated in the booklet mentioned above, which he wrote shortly after his return to Wittenberg, that to avoid giving offense to the weak was not the reason for the restoration of Roman Catholic forms of worship at this time. He wrote concerning the Scriptural form of the communion service (giving the cup as well as the bread to the laity, a practice which involved the abolition of the mass), as follows:

> I shall refrain here from giving the reason why I did not permit this usage to continue in Wittenberg. There is a peculiar incidental reason which it is not necessary to mention.[22] They ask me, since this usage is Scriptural, why did you not permit it to be continued in Wittenberg and in other places where it had been introduced? My answer is, I regret that it is not and cannot be observed.[23]

It is a fact that the reforms which were introduced in Wittenberg by Carlstadt and others could not be maintained except by jeopardizing the immediate outward success of the movement to be brought about by the support of the government. Elector Frederick, as has been shown, personally approved of the reforms, but since he considered these things primarily from the political point of view, he had, under pressure of the imperial authorities, given orders for the abolition of the reforms. Luther thought it best to refrain from stating the true reason why he had decided to again abolish evangelical worship at this time.

That regard for "the weak" was not the real motive for abolishing evangelical forms in 1522 became clear when Elector John, in 1525, abolished Romanism and established the Lutheran creed in his whole realm. While in 1522 the population of Wittenberg had demanded the introduction of the reformation, this cannot be said of the people of Saxony as a whole in 1525. Yet, at this time the reformer had no suggestion to make concerning the need of "sparing the weak." Elector John gave orders that the priests of his land should discard the mass and other Roman Catholic practices; that they should accept the new creed, and the new order of worship, and preach the Gospel. The priests were willing to be guided by these instructions. The population was never asked concerning these momentous changes.

What Elector John undertook for Saxony, Landgrave Philip did for Hesse and other rulers for their provinces and countries.

---

[22] *"Eine sonderliche zufaellige Ursache davon nicht not ist zu schreiben."* Erlangen edition, XXVIII, p. 300.

[23] Erlangen edition, XXVIII, p. 299f.

In this way Lutheranism was established in all states whose rulers accepted the new creed, as well as in states which through military operations were conquered by the elector and the landgrave, as for example the Duchy of Braunschweig, a strictly Catholic land, in which the reformation was at once established. The population was not prepared for an intelligent acceptance of the new creed, and yet the idea of "sparing the weak" was entirely lost sight of.

With the decision for a close union of church and state the principle of liberty of conscience was necessarily discarded, though Luther continued to uphold it in theory. The first case on record in which the magistrates were called upon to take action in the way of suppressing religious dissent was that of the preacher (priest) of Oelsnitz. Luther's grievance against him was that he "is leading the people, or at least not opposing them" in taking steps toward practical reformation without the consent of the civil authorities. Upon receiving word of developments at Oelsnitz, Luther wrote to Michael von der Strassen, at Borna, the head of the magistracy of this district: "My petition therefore is that you instruct the officer at Oelsnitz that he command the preacher to go slowly and first of all preach Christ, and to discard his fanaticism or leave the place."[24] On December 5, 1523, Luther wrote to the same officer, admonishing him earnestly "to use force and either drive the preacher of Oelsnitz away or compel him to talk this awkward notion out of the people and to recant. . . . Have one or six taken by the neck and cast into prison, and the devil will cease to act in this way."[25] Luther adds that he had a short time before written a letter in regard to this matter to the town council of Oelsnitz. A few weeks later the pastorate of Oelsnitz was vacant. Whether the minister had fled or been removed by force is uncertain. Carlstadt was also exiled from Saxony on account of doctrinal dissent.

In the earlier period of the Lutheran and Zwinglian reformation movements not a few evangelists, in Switzerland called "readers," were engaged in spreading evangelical doctrine. They labored principally in provinces and cantons in which the civil authorities were favorably inclined toward the reformation. But even in such territory the efforts of these men soon became unwelcome to the authorities and were regarded with displeasure, since their work was not under state control and had a tendency

---

24 De Wette, *Dr. Martin Luthers Briefe, Sendschreiben und Bedenken,* II, p. 423.

25 *"Lasset einen oder sechs beim Halse nehmen und ins Loch werfen, so wird der Teufel sich anders stellen." Ibid.,* p. 439.

to make people feel that state control for the church was uncalled for. The civil authorities who favored the reformation decided that the new church must be united with the state, and therefore as a rule did not permit any religious work except such as was definitely under state control. As concerns mission work in territory ruled by outspoken Romanists, the leading reformers, who hoped to win these rules, had reason to believe that Protestant mission work would annoy them and minimize the chances of winning them for the reformation. After the establishment of Protestant state churches Luther did not permit evangelical mission work in Roman Catholic territory. While formerly (e. g., in his booklet mentioned note 9) he had approved of such work, he now took the opposite attitude. In his *Exposition of the 82nd Psalm*[26] written in 1530, he forbade missionary work in Roman Catholic territory.

In a booklet against the Anabaptists,[27] published two years later, Luther contemptuously refers to those who attempted to do religious work in any territory whose civil authorities did not permit them to labor in public, as sneaks and hedge-preachers, since their work was done without the knowledge and consent of the authorities. He condemns and denounces such work in the severest terms. This attitude, of course, precluded all Protestant mission work in strictly Roman Catholic territory. Had there been Protestant missionaries in such territory, they would have been hedge-preachers in this sense. Anabaptist evangelists and ministers were hedge-preachers in all countries and provinces with the exception of Moravia. To ask them to labor in public was simply to demand that they give the authorities the opportunity to apprehend and execute them. It may be recalled that the German *Reichstag* held at Speier, in 1529, had passed a decree demanding that "all Anabaptists and rebaptized persons" should be executed without trial or sentence.

An imprisoned Anabaptist minister at Jena in Saxony, Heinz Krauth, was, in 1536, asked by Melanchthon, the well-known collaborator of Luther, "why he and others of his sect preached in secret places and not publicly," and received the striking reply, "The divine word is most severely persecuted and we are not permitted to preach."[28] The truth of this statement is exemplified by

---

26 Erlangen edition, XXXIX, pp. 225-264.

27 *Von den Schleichern und Winkelpredigern.* Weimar edition, XXX, pp. 510-527. Erlangen edition, XXXI, pp. 214-226. In the same year Luther wrote the preface to Menius' book, *The Anabaptists' Doctrine,* in which he expressed similar sentiments (Weimar ed., XXX, pp. 209-214).

28 *Corpus Reformatorum,* II, p. 1001.

the fact that Heinz Krauth was beheaded on January 27, 1536, in Melanchthon's presence and with his approval. Krauth and his friends reproved Melanchthon for sanctioning the persecution. They were in turn reminded that it was not the ecclesiastical but the civil authorities who would deal with them, whereupon they said, "Yes, yes, you would wash your hands, like Pilate."[29] It was impossible for dissenters from the established creed in Protestant as well as in Catholic states to labor in public.

The most essential point in which Luther's teaching differed from Romanism is the great evangelical truth of justification by faith, the central doctrine of the Gospel. The meaning of this doctrine is that the sinner cannot save himself by sacraments, ceremonies, or works. These things will not result in the true Christian experience of grace. Salvation is obtained through personal faith in Christ, the Redeemer, through the substitutionary atonement made for sin on Calvary. However the proclamation of this doctrine had not the consequences and fruits which the reformer expected from it.

The failure to bring forth the fruits of true Gospel preaching was due largely to overlooking the fact that in Scripture the doctrine of justification by faith is inseparably connected with repentance and personal faith. There was a one-sided preaching of grace at the expense of the Scriptural truth that saving faith necessarily results in newness of life. Besides, Luther's teaching on the sacraments (regeneration through baptism and forgiveness of sins through the communion) was not consistent with the doctrine of justification through faith.

On the whole, the results of the Lutheran and Zwinglian reformation movements fell far short of what the promising earlier years of the movement would lead one to expect, and this fact was freely recognized by the reformers themselves. Luther (who outlived Zwingli a decade and a half) in his later years often expressed disappointment at the final outcome of the reformation movement. He stated frequently that the people had become more and more indifferent toward religion, and that their moral condition was more deplorable than ever. His last years were embittered by the observation that the attempted wholesale reformation of the church was successful in only a very limited sense.

---

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 998.

An outstanding cause of the comparative failure of the movement was the domination of the state over the church which gave the movement a character of compromise. The changes in faith and practice from Romanism were brought about by the civil authorities ordering the priests to accept the new creed and preach the Gospel. The people themselves had no voice in the matter. They were permitted to follow their own convictions only to the extent that their convictions were in agreement with the decrees of the civil authorities. The civil authorities were principally interested in political matters. They considered religious questions mainly from the political viewpoint. The church was state-made and state-controlled; it became in fact a mere department of the state. Somewhat later, at the *Reichstag* held in Augsburg in 1555, the principle expressed by the sentence *cujus regio ejus religio* (he who is master of a given region, or country, is also master of the religion of its inhabitants) was formally accepted. The civil rulers were formally recognized as the authorities over the faith of their subjects.

We have seen that the reformers taught that the mass, or the supposed repetition of the sacrifice of Christ on Calvary by the priest, is blasphemy and idolatry, and nevertheless held that the observance of the mass must be continued until the rulers saw best to abolish it. Such a grossly inconsistent attitude had necessarily disastrous consequences for the religious life of the people. To thoughtful persons such an attitude could scarcely mean anything but that the religious leaders, despite their beautiful words to the contrary, substituted expediency for principle. Their claim of accepting the authority of Scripture seemed absurd in the face of their practical attitude toward an observance which they denounced as blasphemy.

The demand to continue the observance of the mass, because of the desires of the civil authorities, made it appear that the people were expected to be religious for the sake of the government. The religious need and conscience of the people were relegated to a secondary place. Such an attitude of glaring compromise crushed out the genuinely religious earnestness which was in evidence in earlier stages of the movement. When the mass was finally abolished, it was of course a simple thing for the authorities to order the priests to preach the Gospel, but it goes without saying that the priests were far better prepared to say mass than to carry out this command. Many of them lived scandalous lives and were grossly ignorant. Some had strange notions as to the meaning of

the Gospel. There is convincing evidence that there were those who took the doctrine of justification by faith to mean that the question of sin was to be taken more lightly than they had formerly supposed.[30]

The union of church and state involved, as indicated above, the abandonment of the New Testament principle of the church as a body of believers, distinct from the world and separated from it unto a holy life in the service of God. On the excuse that the form of church government is not a matter of primary importance, churches were established which were not churches in the scriptural sense. The unchristianized portion of the population was included in the church. Hence the mission field of the church was within its own borders. It became the business of the church to lead its own members to Christ, instead of the outside world. A prominent Protestant church historian, Professor Karl Mueller, of Tuebingen, Germany, says: "The aggressive, conquering power which Lutheranism manifested in its first period was lost everywhere at the moment when the governments took matters in hand and established the Lutheran creed."[31]

Luther always recognized that the promiscuous church in which the whole population was compelled by the civil authorities to hold membership, and in which the exercise of discipline was impossible, was not a true church. He taught that the true church is invisible. It is as a matter of fact obvious that the organized church is not identical with the mystical body of Christ. Nevertheless, it need scarce be said that a church consists of visible persons. The church is the light of the world. Like a city that is set on a hill, it is not invisible. Luther often spoke of the general population, which was identical with the state church, as the multitude, or the rabble, instead of the church, and frequently stated that the condition of the populace in general was deplorable. He often said that he had abandoned the hope for their Christianization. Often he expressed himself to the effect that the number of true Christians, or of those who were church members in reality, was very small.

As indicated above, Luther in an earlier period of his labors as a reformer, recognized the need of organizing a New Testament church consisting of congregations of Christian believers who walked in newness of life. In April of the year 1522 he expressed

---

[30] Compare the description given by Menno Simons, *Complete Works,* I, p. 112, of the evil life of men who boasted of evangelical liberty.

[31] Mueller, *Kirchengeschichte,* II, p. 476.

the hope that "we who now are nearly altogether heathen under a Christian name, may yet come to have a Christian assembly" in which discipline could be practised.[32] In the following year[33] he said in a sermon that a separation of the church from the indifferent masses was necessary. Again he stated in the same year that he dared not undertake this, for he had not the people for it. After the new state church which comprised the whole population of the state had been established, he continued to entertain the hope that true Christian congregations, consisting of believers and practising discipline, could yet be formed. In December, 1525, he had an important conversation "concerning the establishment of a true Christian church" with Caspar Schwenkfeld who visited him in Wittenberg. Schwenkfeld called attention to the fact, admitted by Luther, that the establishment of the new state church had failed to result in spiritual and moral betterment of the people. Schwenkfeld added that in his opinion such betterment could not be looked for unless those who were in earnest in their Christian profession were gathered into congregations exercising scriptural discipline. Otherwise, he said, things would go from bad to worse, as was even now noticeable.

Schwenkfeld relates further that Luther "regretted very much that no amendment of life was in evidence. As concerned the future organization of the church, he was not fully decided. But he was thinking of entering the names of those who were in earnest in their Christian profession in a book. Among them discipline could be exercised and he was thinking of preaching for them in the chapel of the former Augustinian cloister, while a chaplain should preach for the others at the parish church." Schwenkfeld says further: "I continued to question him on church discipline and asked him definitely what was to be done in this respect. He would not answer me on this point." In conclusion Luther said that he had not the people to make the plan for establishing a church separated from the multitude practicable.[34]

Within a few weeks after this discussion with Schwenkfeld Luther published a book[35] in which he repeated these sentiments. He pointed out that it would be fully in accordance with gospel

---

[32] Holl, K., *Gesammelte Aufsaetze zur Kirchengeschichte,* 1923, p. 359.

[33] *Ibid.,* p. 360.

[34] *Corpus Schwenkfeldianorum,* II, pp. 280 f.; Ecke, K., *Schwenckfeld, Luther und der Gedanke einer apostolischen Reformation,* pp. 101 f.

[35] *Deutsche Messe und Ordnung des Gottesdienstes,* Weimar edition, XIX, pp. 70-113. The passage is found p. 75.

principles, if "those who were in earnest in their Christian profession (*die mit Ernst Christen sein wollen*) and who confess the gospel with their lives and tongues," should have their names entered in a book and should have meetings separately from the multitude, and observe various evangelical practices including church discipline. He repeated the statement made to Schwenkfeld that he as yet had not the people for such a church.[36] In the spring of 1527 also Luther expressed the hope that such a church would become a reality.[37]

Now there were naturally those who realized with Luther that the state churches were not churches of the New Testament type, and who clearly recognized an intolerable compromise in state churchism with all its baleful implications. And many who were led to this realization had the courage of their conviction. They refused to unite with the state church, and insisted on establishing a truly evangelical church independent of the state. This resulted in the rise of the Swiss Brethren movement. The leaders in this movement found the people which Luther supposed could not be found. The Swiss Brethren were the older branch of the Mennonite Church. They existed as a church since January, 1525. Menno Simons' conversion and renunciation of the Roman Catholic Church, it may be recalled, took place in 1536 in Friesland. Those who are familiar with the account of his conversion, written by himself, know that he was not the founder of the brotherhood with which he united. The name Mennonite came into use at a later date.

---

[36] Regret that such a church could not be organized, because of the difficulty of finding members for it, was expressed by Luther in various other instances. Cf. Weimar edition X, p. 2, 39, XII, p. 693.

[37] Erlangen edition of Luther's Works, LIII, p. 400.